

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 810

JC 940 414

TITLE Transfer: Preparing for the Year 2000. A Report on the California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium (California, 1994).

INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.

PUB DATE Jun 94

NOTE 50p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Articulation (Education); College Role; *Community Colleges; Diversity (Institutional); Educational Cooperation; Educational Trends; *Equal Education; Higher Education; *Role of Education; *Transfer Policy; Transfer Programs; Transfer Students; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

In April 1994, a Transfer Symposium was held by the California Community Colleges to bring educational analysts and policymakers together to discuss trends and issues affecting the transfer process and other aspects of educational access. This report presents transcripts from the two panel presentations and minutes from the three discussion sessions that comprised the Symposium. The first panel presentation, "The Role of Community Colleges in California Higher Education: Looking Forward," discusses the issue of access in the face of spiraling costs and declining enrollments, and the urgency of finding new solutions for access problems. The second panel presentation, "Community College Overview: Roles and Responsibilities in the Transfer Process," examines student access in the community college transfer process and what colleges are and are not doing to promote transfer. Next, minutes from the first discussion session, "Student Equity and Diversity in the Transfer Process," focus on recent efforts to achieve equity for students from diverse backgrounds. Minutes from the second discussion session, "What Is the Evolving Role of the System in Ensuring Academic Success," review planning issues related to demographics, technology, funding, and the complexities of the transfer process and college mission. The final discussion, "Ask the Universities: How Can We Work Together," explores cooperative possibilities to increase effectiveness in the areas of access and instruction. Recommendations are included for each discussion session. (KP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Transfer: Preparing for the Year 2000

A Report on the 1994 California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "



Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Student Services and Special Programs Division

June 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Transfer:
Preparing for the
Year 2000**

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Acknowledgments.....	3
Introduction	5
Panel Presentation I: The Role of the Community Colleges in California Higher Education: Looking Forward	9
Panel Presentation II: Community College Overview: Roles and Responsibilities in the Transfer Process	23
Discussion Session I: Student Equity and Diversity in the Transfer Process	37
Discussion Session II: Community Colleges and Higher Education in California: What is the Evolving Role of the System in Ensuring Student Academic Success?	41
Discussion Session III: Ask the Universities: How Can We Work Together?	45

Executive Summary

As noted by one panelist during this year's California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium, there are two primary purposes for providing education in the United States. The first is to develop a trained and educated work force. The second, however, is even more fundamental in a democratic society—recognizing, and supporting, the role that education plays in providing social and economic equity.

The universal message of the nation's community colleges has always been: "Education offered here." Working adults and part-time students have been commonplace at the community colleges since the 1980s. More than half of all women in postsecondary education are served by community colleges—and more ethnic minorities than those attending all of the nation's four-year colleges and universities combined.

Just how well transfer "works" for California higher education matters. Cutbacks caused by California's ongoing budget crisis along with rapid and unrelenting student fee increases have led to declining enrollments at all levels of higher education. As costs increase—as general access to higher education decreases—open doors at the California Community Colleges are more necessary than ever before. Equally important, however, are doors that are open for community college students at other postsecondary institutions.

The Role of the Community Colleges in California Higher Education: Looking Forward was the first panel discussion at the California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium held in April, 1994. Chief among the issues discussed by these education policy experts was the question of access. Between 1991 and 1993 enrollments within the California State University system declined by

over 21,000 students, and at the California Community Colleges by 120,000. That trend continued in 1994, with a decline of 10-15,000 more students at CSU and 75,000 at the community colleges. One panelist suggested that the decision to curtail access has already been made—and that decision has been "camouflaged" as a budget related decision. Given finite dollars at present, he suggested that different ways of "delivering our educational product," including increased use of new technologies, provide options for guaranteeing continued access.

Another panelist stated that alternatives to limiting educational access have never been discussed, and the third panelist concurred, observing that "the community colleges are at the center of the access question—not only access to higher education and opportunity, but also access to better jobs for California in the future."

Since the National Center for Higher Education Management predicts an increase of 50 percent in potential higher education enrollment for California by the year 2006, panelists agreed that the state's changing demographics increase the urgency of finding new solutions for the problems of educational access. Devising a statewide educational strategy—one that stresses the interconnected nature of all segments of California education—and creating a new, less "self-serving" system of cooperative incentives and disincentives were viewed as top priorities, along with developing an explicit policy statement about what California expects from its educational institutions.

The symposium's second panel discussion, **Community College Overview: Roles and Responsibilities in the Transfer Process**, examined the question of student access to higher education—especially access provided by the

community college transfer process—from an “insider” perspective.

Panelists differed as to whether the California Master Plan for Higher Education was outdated. Some panelists considered the Master Plan elitist, perhaps bigoted. The general consensus was that the public still strongly supports California’s concept of universal access to higher education, yet this is not a high priority for the Legislature.

Alternatives offered for supporting educational equity included allowing qualified community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees.

A first step proposed for increasing transfer success for community college students system-wide is improved course-to-course articulation with CSU and UC—or implementing a “competency-based” transfer articulation system. One panelist also discussed the importance of promoting alternative relational teaching styles, since not all students are analytical “linear” learners.

Educating the state Legislature about the importance of the community colleges and their students, and exerting political pressure to see that an adequate number of transfer slots for community college students are available at UC and CSU, were top priorities.

Three small-group discussions—designed to generate specific recommendations for action—were also organized by the Transfer Symposium.

The first, **Student Equity and Diversity in the Transfer Process**, focused on relatively recent efforts to achieve equity in California higher education for students from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. The combination of “pluralism and excellence,” one panelist stated, means achieving qualitative—not just quantitative—equity in education. A formal assessment process to evaluate “campus climate,” or the perceptions of students, faculty, and staff about specific areas of college life, has now been developed and has been widely used.

Much is already known about how to support the success of underrepresented students from the notable previous successes of various programs, another panelist pointed out. Making use of this

knowledge—from how to instill a “sense of belonging” to establishing high expectations for student performance—is as important for high schools as it is for colleges and universities, he said.

The second discussion group was titled **Community Colleges and Higher Education in California: What is the Evolving Role of the System in Ensuring Academic Success?** One panelist observed that there are four major areas with which colleges must deal effectively in order to improve the transfer function of behalf of community college students: demographics, technology, funding, and the complexities of both the community college mission and the transfer process itself. Since all four issues are intertwined, piecemeal adjustments and reforms are inadequate.

Another panelist stated that the Master Plan for Higher Education “doesn’t work today.” The population of California higher education is no longer made up solely of young, full-time, middle-class students, the clientele the system was designed to serve. As a result the unemployed, low-income, and disadvantaged are not well served.

New approaches are needed, approaches that “bring the education to the students” rather than insist that the students meet the needs of the institution. One possibility is to offer three-year baccalaureate degrees at both the community college and university levels—and other changes that accommodate the needs of part-time and working students. The broad range of legitimate education goals should be recognized, and supported, by institutions and by the programs and services they offer.

The third discussion group—**Ask the Universities: How Can We Work Together?**—examined both past and present university practices relating to community college transfer. It was pointed out that all of California higher education now faces the problem of how to serve more students with fewer resources; reorganization is underway at UC and CSU. According to one panelist, new technologies will be the salvation of California higher education—and will help educational systems work together more effectively,

primarily in the areas of (1) access and (2) instruction. Technologies such as Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) will allow the transfer process in particular to become much more efficient and

accessible. And in the very near future ATM-style on-campus kiosks will be able to offer nearly complete transfer information and services to today's busy students.

Acknowledgments

So many people have generously offered their personal goodwill and professional expertise in support of the California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium that when it comes to saying "thanks"—like any serious discussion of the community college transfer issue itself—it's difficult to know where to start and where to end. With that in mind, I've decided to start at the beginning.

My deepest gratitude to California Community Colleges Chancellor David Mertes for his thoughtful introductory keynote address, especially his reminder that all of our efforts should focus on finding solutions that meet the needs of community college students. This student-centered perspective is too often the first thing sacrificed in public discussions about education. I am also grateful to Chancellor Mertes for his strong ongoing support for a healthy transfer function in California.

Sincere thanks also to Thelma Scott-Skillman, Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Programs, for her own strong commitment to community college students and her genuine support for the transfer process that serves them. Without her vision, enthusiasm, and guidance, this year's Transfer Symposium would not have been possible.

I'm also grateful to Karen Halliday, former Dean of Student Services and Programs, for "helping to make it happen." Many thanks also to Desiree Sale, Program Assistant for Student Services and Programs, who provided invaluable staff

support and personally took on many logistical headaches, and to Julie Moore, for her patience and persistence in handling endless clerical details as well as registration.

Special thanks to Dr. Mark Edelstein of College of the Redwoods, who so graciously agreed to serve as moderator for both of the symposium's major panel discussions. He was as well-informed as he was well-prepared, and as a direct result became an integral part of these intriguing public conversations.

I am also grateful to Kim Weir, author and editor of this document, for gritting her teeth and seeing this project through to the end. I appreciate her professional contributions to the development and design of this report, and especially her good-natured acceptance of innumerable changes and rewrites.

I extend very special thanks as well to all those who participated as panelists and discussion group facilitators. It was a very impressive series of presentations by equally impressive individuals.

Most of all, I'd like to thank everyone "in the trenches" who attended the symposium, from counselors and guidance staff to faculty and administrators. It's truly inspiring to spend time with so many who care so deeply about California's community colleges and their students.

—Kathleen Nelson, Coordinator
for Transfer and Articulation

Introduction

There was a time when California's Community Colleges, like the rest of the state's system of higher education, seemed capable of doing almost anything and everything. Those times are gone, at least for the foreseeable future, replaced by these times—times in which declining budgets and accelerating demands for services are forcing colleges and universities to rethink old assumptions, and to search for new, innovative, yet less expensive ways to accomplish increasingly complicated tasks.

How did California's community colleges arrive at this juncture? And what can be done under these challenging circumstances to enhance and expand educational opportunity, now and in the future?

Where We've Been: Perspectives on the Passing Millennium

The community colleges have broadcast a universal message since the first one opened its doors to the public a century ago. And that message has been: "Education available here." Though what that education entailed may have varied from place to place nearly as much as national geography, accessibility has generally been a given.

Nationwide, community college enrollment increased from slightly more than one-half million in 1960 to four million by 1980—an increase largely responsible for the overall expansion of higher education and largely due to students who otherwise would not have participated in postsecondary education.

By the 1980s, working adults and part-time students became commonplace on community college campuses. In addition, community colleges serve at least half of all women in postsecondary education and more ethnic minority students than all of the nation's four-year colleges and universities combined. The community colleges also serve more than half of all college freshmen—a role of continuing importance as education costs continue to climb.

The community colleges in California were established as a system more than 70 years ago. These early city colleges or "junior" colleges offered new opportunities for entire generations of Californians to benefit from higher education.

California's commitment to educational access and opportunity was expanded and codified in 1960 in the California Master Plan for Higher Education—a decision that extended the benefits of a college education to every citizen, and a legacy unmatched by any other state of the union.

Since the inception of the California Community Colleges system most campuses have accomplished two major educational missions, offering both transfer and vocational education programs.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the community colleges provided high-quality undergraduate education at very low cost—and provided the first two years of college-level coursework for many California college students who later went on to receive bachelor's, master's, and other degrees.

But as state funding for education began to decrease, college "downsizing," growth limits, and course cutbacks began to affect the California Community Colleges—and the open-ended mission of the community colleges. Even the "lifelong learning" concept as once applied to California's total

system of higher education—the community colleges, the California State University (CSU) system, and the University of California (UC) system together—fell into some disfavor, at least in terms of fiscal responsibility, partially due to criticism that higher education institutions were trying to be “all things to all people” and at increasing public expense.

With university budgets straining to keep up with the costs of graduate education programs, the idea dawned of enrolling more undergraduates. Greater numbers of undergraduate students generated substantial revenue for the universities with minimal increases in costs.

As growing numbers of California college students enrolled as university freshmen, the public began to believe that the quality of community college undergraduate education had declined.

In the 1990s, with all segments of California higher education attempting to cope with budget cutbacks and the impacts of related student fee increases, the public is beginning to believe that the quality of California higher education in general has declined—and may decline still further.

Where We're Going: Perspectives on the Coming Millennium

The quality and the effectiveness of the community college transfer function matters. Nationwide, however, since the 1970s the number of students who transfer to four-year colleges and universities has declined in relation to total community college enrollment.

Since higher percentages of black, Hispanic, Native American, and other underrepresented students begin their postsecondary educations at the community college level, the number of community college students who transfer is an increasingly significant issue in higher education. And as states become increasingly responsible for community

college financing, concerns about fiscal responsibility and “accountability” also affect the transfer function.

In California, there has been moderate success in increasing the number of community college students who transfer to baccalaureate-granting institutions. The passage of Senate Bill 121 (Hart) in 1991 established that responsibility for a strong transfer function is shared by the community colleges, CSU, and UC. That legislation mandated the establishment of transfer agreement programs, discipline-based articulation agreements, and transfer centers. Budget and staff cuts throughout California higher education, however, have slowed implementation of SB 121's key provisions.

What the Experts Say: Perspectives on the California Conundrum

Education experts, including many who attended or were panelists and presenters during the 1994 Community Colleges Transfer Symposium, offer a variety of perspectives on California's higher education conundrum.

Cutbacks caused by the state's ongoing budget crisis—and by the response to that crisis from voters and legislators alike—have led to declining enrollments at all levels of higher education. In a sense, the issues affecting community college transfer success are the same issues affecting all of California higher education in 1994: inadequate funding, limited classroom space, and course and program cutbacks.

These and other current trends in higher education seem still more ominous when discussion shifts to include serious reflection on the educational implications of the state's changing demographics—a change creating the “new face” of California. As was observed by most participants in the 1994 Transfer Symposium, the typical California college student of the very near future will not be fresh out of high school, white, middle class, and attending classes full time. This change in demographics, which includes socioeconomic differences and shifts

in educational goals, suggests that new approaches to higher education delivery are necessary in order to make the transfer function work.

The 1994 California Community Colleges Transfer Symposium was organized to provide a forum for discussing these and other public policy

issues, issues that affect the transfer process and other aspects of educational access and opportunity.

This particular conversation represents only the beginning of what must, ultimately, become a much broader public discussion among Californians about who we are and what we believe about education.

Panel Presentation I

The Role of the Community Colleges in California Higher Education: Looking Forward

The first panel discussion examined the role of the community colleges in California education from an "outside" point of view, from the perspective of analysts and policy makers. Major issues addressed in this wide-ranging discussion included the effects of budget cuts on educational access and opportunity as well as how—and if—the state is prepared, educationally, for the vast social changes posed by changing demographics.

The Panelists

Dr. Joni Finney is Associate Director of the California Higher Education Policy Center. Dr. Finney coauthored, with Patrick Callan, the 1993 report *By Design or Default*. Prior to assuming her post with the Higher Education Policy Center, she was Director of Policy Studies for the Education Commission for the States in Denver, Colorado. Dr. Finney has served also in a variety of administrative posts at Pennsylvania State University and the University of Southern Colorado, and has taught at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Gerald Hayward is Director of Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), an independent research center providing analysis and assistance for California policy makers and educational leaders. He is also the Deputy Director of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, headquartered in Berkeley. From 1980-1985, he was Chancellor for the California Community Colleges. During the decade prior, Mr. Hayward

served as principal consultant to California's Senate Committee on Education and Finance. He is a former teacher and administrator in California public schools.

Dr. Charles Ratliff is Deputy Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and has served as consultant to numerous national, regional, state, and local agencies on a wide variety of topics. Dr. Ratliff has been particularly involved in programs designed to assist disadvantaged youth. He was formerly the director of an Upward Bound program and an EOP program, and was also Director of Student Academic Services at California State University, Hayward.

Dr. Mark Edelstein, moderator of the Transfer Symposium's two panel discussions, has served as Vice President for Academic Affairs at the College of the Redwoods since June, 1991. From 1987 to 1991 he was Executive Director of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council. He served two terms as president of the statewide California Community Colleges Academic Senate, and actively participated in the 1990 review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The Discussion

Edelstein: *There seems to be a very strong consensus in California that despite our current budget problems, the greatest mistake we could make at this point—in all of the educational systems—is to curtail access. Some people*

would argue, however, that in fact that is exactly what our response has been to this budget crisis, and perhaps must be.

Between '991 and 1993 enrollments declined at the California State University by over 21,000 students and at the California Community Colleges by approximately 120,000. That trend has continued this year, with an additional 10-15,000 decline in students at CSU and perhaps 75,000 more at the community colleges. University of California (UC) enrollments have remained relatively stable.

Realistically, if the state cannot increase its funding for higher education, what are our choices besides curtailing access or watching as the quality of California higher education inevitably declines?

Ratliff: We've already made the decision to curtail student access. That decision, however, has been camouflaged as a budget-related decision. We as policy makers and legislators have made budgetary decisions and then turned to the various higher education systems and said: "You've got to figure out what to do with the money we gave you." Given the current paradigms on how we deliver education, we were left with very little opportunity but to cut the number of students that we serve.

Instead, what we need to be doing in this state is have a policy discussion about who we will and who we will not provide with access to higher education, who we will and who we will not invest in. Our social contract, particularly through the Master Plan for Higher Education, basically says that if you live long enough, in California you'll have an opportunity to pursue education after high school. Up until this point, we have had the financial largesse to support that contract. We sold the value of life-long learning and intellectual development—I think rightfully so—and made it available to the entire population.

But if we couple that with the fact that the two fastest-growing segments of the population in the

state are those under age 24 and those over the age of 47, we've created a real problem. Can California continue to afford to allow all segments of its population to have access to higher education? Or is the state going to move in the direction of establishing priorities? If we cannot or do not have the will to finance education at a level that continues to guarantee access to all those who want to pursue education beyond high school, then who do we give the first cut to? That ought to be a policy discussion.

There's a related question, and it's an equally tough one. Is there a different way of delivering our educational product that might allow us to continue to provide high-quality instruction at a lower per-unit cost? It may be that there is a place for high technology in instruction. We need to actively and creatively look for different ways to deliver education, but recognize that there would be some substantial up-front costs. To start out, it's not going to be less expensive.

Both of these policy discussions need to take place.

Finney: My belief is that there's no consensus about that at all, that the biggest policy mistake California could make would be to curtail access. In fact, I believe that's been a deliberate policy decision—to curtail access—at many levels in this state, from the state Legislature to the governing boards of colleges and universities. This is not an accidental

**The question is even more basic:
"As California has previously
defined it, is educational
opportunity still an
important value?"**

strategy. The CSU system, for example, now has a policy that separates the state's responsibility for access and the institution's responsibility for quality. They've developed some deliberate mechanisms to

downsize their student bodies. Students and their families have been held hostage in this budget debate.

Secondly, I don't think that these policy changes ought to be ascribed to budget cuts. That has been our excuse. But that hasn't been our only alternative. The alternatives simply were not discussed. So to say we have no alternatives [to limiting access] is misleading.

I don't think the major question is deciding how to ration higher education over the next 20, 30, 40, or 50 years. The question is even more basic: "As California has previously defined it, is educational opportunity still an important value for California citizens?" If it is, there are many ways to

The community colleges are at the center of the access question—not only access to higher education and opportunity, but also access to better jobs for California.

serve more people.

Hayward: I agree with Joni on this particular issue. The issue is access, and the issue is opportunity. The dilemma is, not only are the community colleges the centerpiece of the whole access argument, but also the centerpiece to other opportunities for further education.

I've spent the last six years working on issues related to preparation of the work force of tomorrow. And it's clear to me that community colleges nationally and in this state are also the linchpin of that strategy. If in fact California's economy is to become more competitive internationally, we have to have a better prepared work

force than we now have. And that work force preparation cannot be done solely at high school. It has to involve what, uniquely, the community colleges can provide.

So I see the community colleges at the center of the access question—not only access to higher education and opportunity in that dimension, but also access to better jobs for California in the future.

I find it very distressing that the issues haven't been framed in those two dimensions, and that the discussions in California—not only at the segmental level but at the gubernatorial and legislative levels—have not addressed this issue head-on. What you hear in Sacramento is that we cannot raise taxes. "That might cost us our jobs, so that's not an option." They have very irresponsibly ducked the key issue. For the sake of California's future, we need to provide more resources.

Edelstein: One fact that makes this discussion even more compelling right now, as Charles mentioned earlier, is the state's change in population demographics. A recent study by the National Center for Higher Education Management determined that between now and the year 2006 we're going to be facing a 50 percent increase in potential enrollments in higher education in California. That's an increase from 915,000 FTES to 1.4 million. The study concludes that even if students can pay a greater share for the cost of their educations, even if the state manages to achieve the same kind of economic growth we saw in the 1980s, it will still be impossible to meet this kind of enrollment demand without significantly altering the basic assumptions and policies which direct higher education. That's the crucial phrase: "without significantly altering the basic assumptions and policies that direct higher education." Easy to say in a report, enormously difficult to do, especially in systems of this size.

Do you agree with this assessment? And if

so, what kinds of restructuring do the systems need to consider in order to better meet the needs of students?

Ratliff: I do agree, in part. We need to look at new ways of delivering quality educational products. We need to move away from the traditional "seat time" approach to delivering higher education, and become far more concerned about the skills and knowledge we'd like to impart to our students. Some approaches do not require direct faculty-student contact.

I also think the community colleges are in a better position than any of the other segments of postsecondary education to find "break-throughs," if you will, in how we're going to deliver instruction to more folks in more efficient ways.

At this point, I don't believe anyone has any concrete answers about just how and at what pace we should proceed.

Edelstein: *Perhaps we should be one system. Alaska has recently consolidated its higher education segments into one system. Perhaps we're reaching the point where the state can no longer support the kind of duplication of effort that our three systems entail. Now, everyone in California higher education will say "We are the*

We need to be thinking more broadly about a system that thinks about preschool through graduate school and less and less about "systems." We have to show that there is an education priority.

largest of our kind in the known universe, and that would create a bureaucratic nightmare."

Joni, as someone relatively new to California, what are your perceptions?

Finney: It's going to take several different ways to try to move the systems to accommodate this new demand without sacrificing access. My sense, from the discussions our center has been holding around the state, is that there is a great deal of energy and creativity in the system now—people doing things on a small-scale basis. But the California problem is the "system-think" problem, where one voice represents the system. Because of that, much of the diversity, much of the creativity, much of the richness is lost.

We need to loosen these systems up and provide some incentives for people to go about the very important work that they want to accomplish. To create such incentives, we can use existing resources. Much of this we know how to do, and much of it doesn't cost much money. It's a question of identifying the priorities.

Hayward: This is already a complicated situation. And I'd hate to think of any education system that's more complicated than the University of California. But, even in this discussion, we're missing the key player—and that's the K-12 system.

What we've neglected is taking a strategic look at education from child care through graduate school. We still have the systems' views of their independent roles, and lack this overall strategy. With this perspective, someone might suggest that child care is the best long-term strategy for improving the four-year institutions.

I use this only as an example. We need to be thinking more broadly and more globally about a system that thinks about preschool through graduate school and less and less about "systems."

We have to show the Legislature and the policy makers that there is an *education* priority in that budget.

Stressing the interconnectedness between the segments, and with the high schools and the elementary schools, will be most fruitful.

Edelstein: *I very much agree with that. But the fact is, we seem to be much farther from that than we were three or four years ago. Three or four years ago, the California Education Roundtable was having serious discussions about that kind of statewide strategy. And it was an important agenda item for both Bill Honig and Ann Reynolds. Today, that discussion isn't even on the table. How do you get back to something like that at a time when we're all consumed with our own budgets and questions of access? These problems may not be as important in a general sense, but are certainly more immediate.*

Hayward: It's a tough issue. I don't know how you do it without changing the priorities. What are the incentives for people in higher education to work collaboratively? As resources are more and more constrained, institutions tend to be more and more protective of their own share. Education would be much better supported if institutions had a single strategy that encompassed what they desired. What incentives would bring all these people to the table? The major incentive would be leadership from the Governor and the Legislature. One thing that might be done: We might eliminate the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and make it "CEC"—the California Education Commission or the Commission on Education for California. Just responding to that new entity would require a different strategy on the part of the participants.

Finney: Even more basic is getting back to the policy that has been abandoned over the last few years—tying enrollment for institutions to dollars. The Governor has virtually abandoned that, with the permission of the Legislature. "We'll give you this money, take as many students as you can." Well, what's the easiest thing to sacrifice, then, when resources are tight? Students. This is particularly true for the California State University system. So I

think we need to reestablish the link between dollars and enrollment. Any new money going into higher education—and I mean additional resources from

There is no reason why upper division course work could not be offered at a community college campus. We should be reducing some of the barriers for students who wish to go on to baccalaureate degrees.

the base we have right now—ought to be used for a set of priorities, not just be allocated to increase that base. We've got to define what is important and target those resources for that.

Ratliff: There ought to be incentives in place to get more out of a *system* of education. Rather than being part of a confederation of segments in public education, institutions become somewhat self-serving—particularly institutions that award baccalaureates but to some degree all of postsecondary education. As institutions, they don't want to do "remedial" kinds of work. Nor do we want to seriously examine what it is that we require for the award of our associate or our baccalaureate degrees. Does it necessarily take 120 or 126 units to be properly educated? Rather than deal with that question, we're now asking, "Is there a way to provide an incentive for students in secondary schools to make more productive use of high school years?" That pushes the problem forward, rather than talking about what we need to be doing in postsecondary to move students more swiftly through his or her academic program. We could find ways to engage students in productive academic preparation. There is no reason why upper division course work could not be offered at a community college campus. We should be reducing some of

the barriers for students who wish to go on to baccalaureate degrees, at a time when everyone is trying to do more with the same or less money. There are incentives that might provide at least a first step toward an integrated system of education.

Edelstein: Another suggestion was made by the California Higher Education Policy Center, to limit some UC and CSU campuses to only upper division and graduate work, and let the community colleges do the bulk of the lower division work.

Ratliff: We don't react particularly favorably to that for a couple of reasons. One is money. Offering only upper division courses, because of the smaller faculty-to-student ratios, is a more expensive proposition. While we don't say it loudly, it is true that we use lower division course work as a vehicle for leveraging dollars to lower student-faculty ratios for upper division. So if we get to the point where we convert UC or CSU campuses into entirely upper division and graduate level institutions—again, assuming no alteration in how we deliver our educational product—we create a more costly enterprise.

Hayward: Wait wait, wait, wait. The university gets its allocation for undergraduate students based on a formula based on a mix of lower division, upper division students, and graduate students, right? Why don't you figure out how much it costs to fund the higher education part of that? What's the number for that, Charles? Is that not a known number? Can we compute that?

Ratliff: We know now, for the University of California, that for the purposes of appropriations for the FTES, we average the lower division undergraduate, the upper division undergraduate, and graduate student. And we pay roughly \$12,200 per FTES.

We know it doesn't cost \$12,000 to educate a lower division student.

Hayward: It occurs to me that it wouldn't be very hard to allocate money on a different basis—on a basis of the cost of graduate school, upper division,

It wouldn't be very hard to allocate money on a different basis. Then you wouldn't have this crazy system that says, "Gee whiz, the more lower division students we cram into these giant lecture halls, the better we can offer upper division and graduate instruction."

and lower division. Then you wouldn't have this crazy system that says, "Gee whiz, the more lower division students we can cram into these giant lecture halls, the better we can offer upper division and graduate instruction." Boy, that's a dumb incentive, if the purpose is to give people a quality education at each level. We could make the playing field more level.

I know the university and state university systems don't want to see this kind of cost averaging go away, but we're in tough times, folks. One thing would be to start making rational decisions about investing in those three categories—and in which the community colleges would be seen as providing lower cost lower division work, and upper division work at the university would be appropriately funded at the cost level. Is there something terribly wrong with that kind of rationale?

Ratliff: I don't think it's terribly wrong. That rationale is a logical one. But it doesn't change the fact that it becomes a more costly operation

if you differentially fund upper division and graduate work.

Hayward: Not on a per-student basis. It costs more for the average student at the University of California, but also the state would be saving money if those lower division funds were spent instead at a community college. And the university would be paid for what it actually did.

Ratliff: The other part of that is, if you follow that same rationale, we may well discover at the university that—as it is currently delivered—the same education is *less* expensive. Therefore, trying to benefit students, one could logically say that we ought to have differential fees because it costs less to provide that instruction.

Finney: What we're talking about so far is looking at the money and trying to cost it out differently to provide for the greatest need. There's another way to look at this. We need to look at the total resources for higher education—not just UC,

**We need to set different
priorities across the
system if we want to
maintain access.**

CSU, and the community colleges—look at the whole range of resources and ask: “What are our priorities?” And cast that against how we're currently spending that money.

Particularly within the University of California, we treat every faculty member as if he or she were a top researcher and potential Nobel Prize winner. That may well be true, but we have to look at different priorities now.

We actually have a state allocation for departmental research. But if you consider the teaching load difference between CSU faculty and UC

faculty, the difference in that sum of money can be viewed as [an additional] state appropriation for research. We ought to look at whether we want that state appropriation to continue. And if, in fact, we want to fund research with state dollars, let's at least do it competitively, like we fund federal research. And let's take some of the money and target it toward undergraduate education.

I think we've got to look at the total resources and the purposes for which they're used, not just the money we have right now for instruction.

We need to set different priorities across the system if we want to maintain access.

Ratliff: Where is there an explicit statement about what we want out of our public institutions? As we talk about changing our priorities for what we spend, what is it that we want out of our public institutions? Simply the provision of instruction? Learning throughout a career? Applied research? Basic research? We need to make that decision. Once that decision is made, it becomes easier to talk about how one prioritizes the use of available resources.

Edelstein: *One thing we want, to get back to the earlier discussion, is access—as much access as we can possibly get. What are your assessments of how transfer is functioning today?*

Over the past decade there has been a

**If there's no pain involved,
there's very little incentive for
an institution to change
historical behavior.**

major focus on transfer issues. We've studied and restudied the Master Plan. We've created transfer centers, funded and unfunded and then

defunded them. We've developed dozens of programs, funded studies, supported legislative

**Do presidents or chancellors
continue in their
positions based upon
what happens to their
students, how well they
prepare their students?**

mandates, and attended endless meetings, all aimed at improving transfer. And yet the total number of transfers to UC and CSU has been essentially static for the last decade, between 50,000 and 55,000 students.

Some people would argue that none of the community college efforts has made a substantial difference—that the only thing that drives the transfer number is the number of graduating seniors, which during the same period has essentially remained stable.

Ratliff: I disagree with you that access is the be all and the end all. That's part of the problem, that we focus on access alone. Transfer doesn't occur simply because you have access. It also relies heavily on the outcomes. After you get there, something occurs that puts you in the position to take the next step. So we have to be concerned about outcomes as well.

As to whether or not the transfer function is working well or not, the honest answer is, "Probably not." It works less well for some students than others.

One reason is that we've layered one thing on top of another. So if something doesn't work after some finite period of time we add something else to it. Then we add yet another thing to it when there's a new idea. And if that doesn't work we throw something else in. After a point, there are so many

efforts trying to promote transfer that they begin to take away from each other.

We need to have fewer categorical efforts and more institutional responsibility for promoting transfer—because faculty are so critical as to whether or not a healthy transfer function exists. If courses are not offered, students don't get it. If the integrity of courses is less than desired, from the point of view of the receiving institutions, you have the age-old battle between faculty at the baccalaureate-granting institutions and the faculty at the community colleges about whether or not the courses are acceptable. Then there's a case-by-case, major-by-major, campus-by-campus type of assessment rather than a system-wide agreement.

But the only way that [a system-wide agreement] is going to happen is through a combination of incentives and disincentives. Though this is probably heresy, it ought to be painful to institutions to make the wrong decision—to decide that it is more important to protect processes than promote the desired student outcomes. If there's no pain involved, there's very little incentive for an institution to change historical behavior.

Hayward: I'm not sure it all has to be pain, Charles. There aren't any consequences. There aren't many incentives, either. This is really a test of the system. What are the consequences for an institution that, we would all agree, doesn't do a very good job of transferring students to another institution? Now, probably none. Do

**How much remedial work
do we do in community
colleges? It's a ton.**

presidents continue in their positions? Do chancellors of systems continue in their positions based upon what happens to their students, how well they prepare their students to transfer to four-year

institutions? Their positions don't have anything to do with the outcomes of transfer or with how well or how poorly they prepare people for work.

And you can't just look at the numbers, because the numbers are often beyond the control of community colleges, especially if there isn't space available at the transfer institutions.

But how about something as simple as an AA degree, which is simple to measure and which does have a value both as a transfer document and as a preparation-for-work document? According to Department of Labor statistics, the income differential between high school graduates and students with AA degrees is quite large. That tells you it's not enough to just mill around.

There are two areas we need to look at. One is, how much remedial work do we do in community colleges? It's a *ton*. How much better would we be as institutions if we did less of that? And I'm not suggesting that we do less of it because it's not important. I suggest that we do less of it because high schools have to do a better job of preparing students for higher education. That gets us back to these linkages between institutions. The resources of the state need to be focused on that problem.

The second thing we need to do is look inside our own houses. I'm convinced that there's too much milling around—too many people in school without clear goals, or without taking the necessary sequence of courses to accomplish those goals. Education cannot afford to allow people to take a little of this and a little of that and hope that someday a little light will come on and they'll find their path to nirvana. It doesn't work that way.

Edelstein: The point that Gerry makes about numbers with regard to transfer is an issue I'd like to pursue with you. The California Higher Education Policy Center did a report last year called Public Policy by Anecdote. It wasn't about transfer, but it could have been about transfer.

How many times have we heard public policy decisions being made based upon whether or not some legislator's nephew got into a specific CSU or UC program? Why don't we know more about transfer? Why have we not been successful in developing a comprehensive student information system? Why aren't we getting the information on applications and enrollees and admits and acceptances systematically from CSU and the UC? We would be able to determine whether there's a transfer problem—and, more specifically, just what it is.

Ratliff: With the comprehensive information system, the biggest liability has been fighting legal battles over how you monitor individual students. We've argued since 1983 that we ought to be using social security numbers—with all of the

**How can you say the system
rewards bringing in bodies?
We're actually rewarding
downsizing.**

appropriate protections. That's the only way we'll be able to monitor the actual movement of students through the systems, and be able to do effective enrollment management and planning—to be able to tell whether or not students are progressing at differential rates, to assess transfer readiness, etc.

The second issue is the ongoing debate about what is the appropriate measure [of transfer success]. I wish to dispel any use of the term "transfer rate." I think it's a misnomer, and suggests that there is a single measure of whether or not the transfer function is healthy. There are multiple measures that make sense.

Gerry has suggested looking at AA degrees. I suggest looking at "transfer readiness"—whether or not the college does everything it's supposed to do as far as providing the right courses, the academic

support, the requisite number of transfer units, and the requisite GPA to be able to make the transfer. The choice that student then makes is independent of whether or not the college did its job.

A second measure could assess transition—whether or not a transfer-ready student made the transition to a baccalaureate institution.

Another measure could focus on how well an institution does with underrepresented students.

We have to get into the habit of talking about multiple measures, not unlike what we've been

We're talking about individual opportunity, not bureaucratic terms.

through with matriculation. We have to look at the actual question being framed, then decide on an appropriate measure.

The third problem is that we continue to operate with some measure of impunity. This state's funding mechanism basically rewards bringing in bodies. It does not recognize or provide rewards for doing things successfully with those students.

Finney: How can you say that, when we've lost 200,000 people from higher education? How can you say the system rewards bringing in bodies? I don't get it.

We're actually rewarding *downsizing*. The numbers would indicate that that's the case.

Ratliff: I disagree. Any funding formula that's based on head count or FTES count is rewarding bodies. If you fail as a state to provide enough dollars to provide for everybody who would like to come in, then you're curtailing access. That's a different question.

If we had a funding formula with a portion tied to the number of students and a portion tied to the

successes of the institution, then you have a system looking at something other than simple head count. We don't have that currently.

Finney: But the system is not really funding bodies. Look at CSU right now. They have more money per student now, and 30,000 fewer students.

Ratliff: What it's funding, though, is a FTES, not each individual student, not a head count. Look at both the enrollment at the CSU and to some extent at the community colleges, and what you'll find is an average increase in the unit load per student.

Finney: We're talking about individual opportunity. We're not talking about state bureaucratic terms. Opportunity is what we've got to keep our eye on.

Ratliff: It's one reason I suggest we need to look at a system of funding that rewards or provides some incentive for achieving outcomes.

It's faculty-to-faculty design of programs that changes what happens in high school and the community colleges.

Edelstein: *In terms of individual opportunity, a statistic that we don't talk much about is the decline in the college-going rate of high school seniors, which has declined from 53 percent to 44 percent over the last decade. That's a remarkable drop at a time when everyone says people need higher levels of skills than they can get through high school in order to succeed in the job market. Almost all of that loss has taken place in the community colleges, from 28 percent to 29 percent, in terms of college-going rates.*

Why do you think the community colleges have become significantly less attractive to recent high school graduates? Gerry, this has

If the segments can't solve *this* issue, then you really have to wonder about their commitment to this notion of access.

happened in the ten years since you've left the Chancellor's Office.

Hayward: I think that's why. [Laughter.] No problem for me to know the answer to that. [Laughter.] No, actually I'm surprised at the number. I'm shocked. What I had focused on—and not recently—was the percentage of students who were fulfilling the requirements to get into UC and CSU. And those numbers have been steadily increasing, until this year, when there was a small blip in the wrong direction. I would assume that the high schools were moving in the right direction.

One thing it could mean, as Joni has suggested so strongly, is that the access for those students has been cut off—that it's not a student choice. They're not finding places available for them. Because if they're going to go through all the work it takes to prepare themselves for the four-year institutions, you would assume that they would go. Perhaps it's been in the past five years, with the financial problems so great, that this access problem has occurred.

Ratliff: You find a correlation with increases in fees. The first blip occurred in 1984, when we went from free to fees at the community colleges. We had two years of that and began to show an increase [of baccalaureate-bound high school students] at the community colleges.

And since 1990-91 we've seen a continued

decline again. A portion of that has to do with the perception that it's simply too far to go, even starting at the community colleges. A portion of it is attributable to the fact that, in these budget battles, the standard political rhetoric of the higher education institutions has changed the decisions of these students and their families. They've heard the gloom-and-doom stories that we'll be laying off hundreds if not thousands of faculty, that we'll cut thousands of course sections, that they'll have a right to line up for the possibility of getting a course. Rather than go through the hassle of doing that, they're simply making the decision *not* to attend.

Edelstein: *One of the unfortunate aspects of the extraordinary higher education system that we have in California is that its very excellence, historically, has made us arrogant about what we do in California. We're loathe to look to other states for models. As I'm sure you're aware, there are some very interesting things going on, in terms of transfer, in other states—Florida, Arizona, Texas, Oregon, Illinois to name just a few. What can we learn from other states, in terms of specifics, to improve the transfer function?*

Finney: That's a good question. We saw some of these things as we visited campuses across the country as part of a recent research project. Using

It is alarming that higher education is falling apart at a time when the populations that would take advantage of higher education are more diverse than they've ever been.

very little money, they got faculty from two- and four-year institutions to design courses—and not

just individual courses but entire programs. There was a collaboration that seemed to work better in places where there was already something to build upon.

We have used the bureaucratic and administrative mechanisms—the course numbering, the articulation agreements—to try to move the students through the system. That's very important. Then we

Quite honestly, we're all at risk right now. There's no guarantee for anybody who's played by the rules, who's done all the things we've told them to do.

look at student services.

But what we have neglected in all of this is the academic coordination that has to take place, too, to look at the situation in a more holistic way.

Unless faculty are really engaged in this process, our efforts are going to be limited. We can only do so much otherwise. The results elsewhere—as far as getting students through the system—have been remarkable in some places.

Perhaps we should look at money to develop a joint core curriculum. That underscores the point about putting the students first.

Hayward: We've been doing work nationally, looking at high schools and community colleges. It's faculty-to-faculty design of programs that changes what happens in high school and the community colleges. Two faculties working together provide a seamless transition, a well-connected program that's sequentially based, with tighter linkage between the two systems. There's no reason to assume that wouldn't also hold for four-year institutions.

Edelstein: *It may be that I like large, simple solutions to complicated problems, but it occurs*

to me—from a student's perspective—that figuring out our course numbering system is enormously difficult. We don't even number in the same bands—not only across segments, but within segments, and sometimes even within districts. Aren't there simple mechanical things that we could do?

Hayward: This is really bleak news. You'd figure, when asked what would be the easiest things to change, people would conclude: "How about course numbers?" *Why* is that so hard?

We had this same discussion years before. And I thought, *this* is one we can solve. This really speaks ill of our willingness to tackle this issue. That boggles my mind. That clearly ought to be a solvable issue between the segments. If the segments can't solve *this* issue, then you really have to wonder about their commitment to this notion of access. And I would say to my community college colleagues in the audience: If you can't even number the courses in your own college, then you shouldn't be *here*, you should be back *there* renumbering your courses.

We're seeing more and more geometric growth, in terms of "new majority" transfers at the community colleges. Transfer is an outcome, and it's one result of retention. Yet I'm not sure how many colleges really focus on retention.

Comments from the Audience

One conference participant observed that there are endless problems for community college counselors and others working to improve student transfer success—from the decategorization of transfer center funds to inadequate counselor-student

ratios. To penalize community colleges for low transfer rates, when transfer projects are understaffed, underfunded, and not even informed about what university campuses may be open to community college students, is highly unfair.

Another participant noted that the primary reason students attend college is to achieve a better quality of life, "and by that I mean better jobs and better money." In the past, a four-year degree virtually guaranteed that. New technologies will offer new jobs, 85 percent of which will pay well *without* a four-year degree. "How does this new reality affect our discussion of transfer and what we'll be doing in the future?"

Hayward responded that this issue is a major item of discussion on the national level:

"What happens if we prepare people for the work force of tomorrow and they go through the process—and then there are no jobs tomorrow? The same thing is true of education in general. The only way I've been able to deal with this is by asking how I would want my son or daughter to be educated. And I would want my son or daughter to be competitively well situated to face whatever uncertain future is out there—and as an educator I would want to move my students as far along the spectrum as I possibly can to help them be better prepared. We can't predict the economy. But one thing I know for certain is that if you don't prepare people better for work and college, we won't be in a position to make the economy in California a better one."

A third member of the audience stated his belief that "education, the California economy, and the emergence of the 'new majority' are inextricably intertwined. We've known since 1974 what today's demographics would be, and transfer has been part of our mission forever. What part does race play? Why? And what should we do about it?"

Finney responded that it is alarming that the higher education system that has served California so well "is now starting to fall apart at the

time when the populations that would take advantage of higher education—that part of the compact—are much more diverse than they've ever been." That fact, she said, is undeniable—so one must ask about the commitment of the current population to future generations.

But, she said, "quite honestly, I think we're all at risk right now. There's no guarantee for anybody who's played by the rules, who's done all the things we've told them to do." The only people who aren't at risk in the arena of higher education, she stated, are "those few who still have enough money to buy their way into the system." Middle-class families—now—are affected along with low-income families. We need a public debate on this issue, Finney said. Opinion polls suggest that *access* is the public's number one priority. "So, how committed are we to educational opportunity?"

Following up on the same question, Ratliff stated that "this is an absolutely critical issue that threatens to bifurcate society if we don't address it." Very, very few students today are pursuing college to be erudite, he said, or to be well-informed about a variety of topics. They want to improve their life circumstances. Like it or not, "we need to educate students for action—not what you know, but what you're willing to do with what you know." Our institutions do a good job of what they were intended to do: "They sort folks, and they educate the sons and daughters of the educated." But extra attention needs to be paid to those students who don't have that kind of family support.

Another audience participant noted that after the near-passage of the school voucher initiative—which came at a time when the state's population of "people who classify themselves as white" will soon be in the minority, demographically—there was some question about whether California would even have public education. "The [higher education compact] was not made with [new majority] students in mind," she said. "Therefore, we have got to change the policy, the teachers, the teaching styles,

the decision makers, the administrators, the advisors, the legislators, the governor, the national leadership. We have not changed those areas, with

**We're offering access to what?
Access to a quality program
in an institution
committed to helping students
get through the system?**

regard to diversity. While we have not changed those things, we still expect those ideas to be applicable to these students." Only in education, she also said, is the standard of "less" considered "better." What's "better" about asking students from community colleges to transfer to institutions which offer little faculty contact and smaller faculty-student ratios?

"There's a number that seems to remain constant" for community college transfer students, another conference participant observed, and is unrelated to how successful the community colleges are in preparing their students for transfer. The number is derived from the number of slots *available* for transfer students at the four-year institutions. "And the standards [at the transfer institutions]—grade point averages—will go up in order to maintain that same number, because otherwise the

four-year institutions would have to expand to accommodate the demand for transfer."

Another member of the audience, however, said "if we get to that point, that won't be a problem—but we're not there yet."

From the standpoint of new majority transfer students, he also said, access is not now an issue. "We're seeing more and more geometric growth, in terms of the new majority transfers at the community colleges. Transfer is an outcome, and it's one result of retention. Yet I'm not sure how many colleges really focus on retention. I urge, whatever we come up with today, that we really take a look at systemic leadership on retention."

"In conjunction with that," Hayward noted, "I don't think that every community college has done all that it could to encourage high school students to come to the community colleges and engage in this enterprise. Getting high school students into college is a heavy recruitment responsibility. Couple that with an effective retention strategy, which now is "usually less than beautiful to behold," he said.

"We're offering access to what?" he asked rhetorically. "Access to a quality program in which the institution is committed to helping that student get through the system?"

One conference participant stated that there is a huge population of nontraditional community college students—those who work during the day and attend class during the evenings and/or on weekends—who also need full access to core transfer and vocational courses and programs.

Panel Presentation II

Community College Overview: Roles and Responsibilities in the Transfer Process

Moderated by Dr. Mark Edelstein, this panel discussion narrowed the focus from the overall educational circumstances and "climate" for education in California to the community colleges themselves—what the colleges are and are not doing to promote more effective student transfer. To the extent that transfer topics were addressed from outside the community college system in the symposium's first panel discussion, here they are discussed by "insiders."

As with the first symposium panel discussion, the breadth and depth of the conversation warranted including almost everything that was said. The following transcript, edited only slightly to achieve brevity and/or clarity, does just that.

The Panelists

Patrick McCallum has been Executive Director of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) since 1981. Under his leadership, FACCC's membership has grown to more than 6,000, and the organization has become a major force in all discussions of community college policy and finance. In Dr. Edelstein's words, "He has been tenacious and tireless in his advocacy, not just for faculty but for the colleges themselves. He is a street fighter with a vicious arsenal of statistics, but also an idealist sincerely committed to the principles of access and quality which undergird the entire community college system." A fellow in the presti-

gious CORO Foundation Program, Mr. McCallum worked as an aide to Assemblymember John Vasconcellos before beginning his tenure at FACCC.

Dr. Richard Moore is President of Santa Monica College. Under his leadership, Santa Monica has developed a reputation for excellence and innovation, both within California and nationally. According to Dr. Edelstein, Dr. Moore is an original thinker "whose sometimes outrageous ideas would be dismissed out of hand if they didn't have the disconcerting habit of somehow proving successful."

Regina Stanback-Stroud is President of the statewide Academic Senate. She formerly served as Vice-President of that organization, and as chair of the Affirmative Action, Local Senate Relations, and Student Equity committees. She is a member of the Health Science Department at Rancho Santiago College, and a recipient of that college's Distinguished Faculty Award. Ms. Stanback-Stroud has served in many capacities on the Rancho Santiago campus, including President of the local Academic Senate, advisor to the African Black Student Union, and mentor in the Higher Ground Program. "Her name has proven prophetic of her leadership style," according to Dr. Edelstein, "which is both regal in demeanor and forceful in approach."

David Viar is Executive Director of the Community College League of California. The league's primary functions include research in educational policy development, support for trustee and staff development, and representation before the executive and legislative branches of both the state and federal governments. Mr. Viar has served as Executive Director of both the National Association of Community College Trustees and the California Community College Trustees Association. According to Edelstein, "He has proven enormously successful in developing consensus, forging coalitions, and convincing 107 disparate entities to occasionally present themselves as a unified system with a single point of view."

The Panel Discussion

Edelstein: *Going back to the study by the National Center for Higher Education Management I mentioned earlier, there will be a 50 percent increase in higher education enrollments between now and the year 2006—a move from 915,000 full-time equivalent students to 1.4 million. Their conclusion—whatever happens to the state economy, and however steep the increases in tuition may be—is that without significantly altering the basic assumptions and policies which direct higher education, we'll simply be unable to serve anything close to this number of students. Do you share this view of education in California? And if so, what kinds of assumptions should we be examining at this point?*

Moore: I think such pessimism is correct. I think California's colleges are going to become like other colleges in the nation—with major tuition charges. We're well on our way there, with \$35 per unit now the norm. Second, I think the transfer job is going to become more difficult, because I think the University of California and California State University—particularly UC—are going to take fewer students. At Santa Monica College, we see our primary job as transfer. So

when the primary place I want to transfer my students is to UC, and UC is going to take fewer students, there's a serious question about whether the Master Plan is a good plan. We're not following it. We have, instead, separate and unequal parties that it will be harder and harder to couple.

So, I have some pessimism. We've gone through about eight years of tough times. I prefer not to ignore the last eight years. They represent a trend. And it's a trend the politicians are going to stay with. They like downsizing education. They're upsizing prisons. They like giving us tuition. And they're not going to pressure the University of California to take more transfer students.

Edelstein: *David, you and Patrick were very much involved in the last review of the Master Plan, which essentially reaffirmed the current structure [of higher education]. How do you feel about that now? Is the Master Plan an outdated framework for California?*

Viar: No, I don't believe the Master Plan is outdated. I believe some of our ideas on how to achieve it are outdated. I also think, unlike Richard's [pessimistic view], that the public believes very strongly in access to higher education.

**It's a trend politicians
are going to stay with.
They like downsizing
education. They like upsizing
prisons.**

And I think that's an area that we in education haven't tapped enough. Some of the polling done by the Higher Education Policy Center has shown strong support among the general public for the concept of access to higher education. Now, the definition of higher education—what that means, what the specific expectations are—can certainly

vary. I think we have to do more in convincing the general public that we have to do some things differently. But the basic underpinning of the Master Plan—access to higher education, the role of the

The social contract regarding education in California has changed since the 1960s and 1970s.

community colleges, and the role of the universities—I believe is still strong, and still appropriate for the coming years.

McCallum: Going back to your first question, if you look at your 500,000 FTES, that translates into about 800,000 more students. Given the current tax structure in this state, if we keep the same funding mechanisms there will not be enough money to fund 800,000 more students. So I'm more interested now in what we do about that.

The first thing we could do is talk about what the Master Plan is, what our vision is, what's important. For the sake of education, we have to do what the Governor and the Legislature did on crime. In just six months they agreed to spend an additional \$2 billion per year, they agreed to add to the cost of government, to deal with crime. If they could do that on the issue of crime, educators need to put forth the vision of what we believe in, what's important about education, and talk about that. If we don't talk about the importance of education, no one else will. The fact is, the politics of this state do interrelate.

The social contract regarding education in California has changed since the 1960s and 1970s. Here's what's different: 80 percent of the voters in this state are white, yet 55 percent of those who most use government services—45 percent at the community colleges—are culturally and ethnically

diverse. There has been a direct correlation with political changes in this state.

Secondly, we have to be able to change. We have to rethink how we do things. We know that with more direct contact with students, success rates increase. We need to look at new strategies, new teaching techniques. We need to look at distance learning, at least partially. We need to restructure the University of California system. We need to achieve simpler goals for the good of the system. We have to be open to finding ways to educate more students. Frankly, the Legislature is going to have to force us to do it—UC, CSU, and the community colleges.

But whatever we do, we're still not going to be able to educate 800,000 more students by 2006. The third issue is prioritization. Who doesn't get to go to college? Someone will not have access. We have to be willing to talk about that. Politicians don't want to admit it, for political reasons. People in the colleges and universities don't want to discuss it, since that would amount to political suicide.

Clearly, our first priority must be educating the "new majority" students, particularly first-generation college students. After that, the tough work really begins.

Edelstein: Regina, what do you think about this notion of "prioritization," or downsizing? A number of faculty I've spoken to, when pushed on the issue, think it wouldn't be a bad idea for the community colleges to do less of this or less of that—and to, in fact, deal with a smaller, "more teachable" cohort of students. Does the Academic Senate have a position on this?

Stanback-Stroud: The Senate doesn't yet have a formal position. It's my perspective that the basic assumptions we have in the Master Plan, the basic assumptions upon which we base much of our implementation, are probably right and just. But the translation of those into implementation is different. When we talk about doing less, about how some

students may not have access to education, I think we also need to be talking about the alternatives. Many students are interested in achieving a higher

The assumptions of the Master Plan are elite assumptions.

standard of living—even at UC, where the biggest vocational education programs are called the College of Medicine and the College of Dentistry. There may be alternatives to transfer. And there may be alternatives to transfer to UC and CSU, especially in the area of economic development activities.

Ultimately, if you look at the assumptions of the Master Plan, they are elite assumptions. If the top 12 percent of students go to UC, even if you have your fourth graders reading Toni Morrison and Faulkner there is still going to be a top 12 percent. Perhaps that assumption needs to be reconsidered—because no matter how successful we are in educating our students, there will always be a “bottom part” to the hierarchy, and we have to watch what we assume about what we should do with that bottom part.

Moore: I don’t want to be misread. I responded to your question with “Where are we going?” not “What’s good.” We’re kidding ourselves if anyone thinks things are going well. Go visit your local college and ask if their fall plan is for a larger student population, same size, or smaller. I’m not talking about what’s good, I’m talking about what we’re doing. The forecast is bad. And I think we can do a heck of a lot to change things. But that’s a different question, “Can we do something different?”

In my opinion there are some things we could do differently.

The Master Plan, in my view, is a bigoted, prejudicial plan. You take the top 12 percent of students and send them to palaces and then give them twice the amount of money per student,

then ask how well are they doing? You give me that model and I’ll take all comers. You give me half the money, so-so facilities, then ask, how well am I doing? It’s not an even playing field.

But I’m willing to live with an *uneven* playing field, if you will untie my hands. Here’s an example:

We run a great nursing program at Santa Monica College. Nobody lets me run my nurses through to a baccalaureate degree. And I can do that at Santa Monica without adding one faculty member or one course to my curriculum. I already run a two-year vocational nursing program, and I already run a liberal arts degree program. But nobody lets my students stay for 120 units on my campus and get the R.N. major and liberal arts degree—the general education program—and lets me hook those two together. Nobody lets me say: “You’ve got a bachelor of science degree. You don’t have to worry about articulation.” And I don’t have to get one more teacher. I could run a BS degree program in nursing and start cranking out BS degrees, *without any cost to the state of Califor-*

**I think it’s time to try
some experiments.
I don’t want to just sit
around and whine about
why I don’t have
enough money, about why
I can’t do the job.**

nia. But the state has no interest in doing that. In general, there’s no interest in doing that.

We have all the resources today to maintain quality, to use our own faculty to teach academic classes and issue baccalaureate degrees. Minorities would have four-year degrees.

You ask, where are the minorities? They’re sitting in the community colleges, they’re sitting at

Santa Monica College, which is 35 percent white. We happen to have the best transfer rate in the state of California. But I could *double* my baccalaureate degree rate if someone would let me offer a baccalaureate in nursing. I could also do it in accounting. If the goal is to get more people—and, in particular, more people of color—through to a four-year degree, I “own” the resources to do that on my campus and am legally blocked from doing that job.

I think it’s time to try some experiments. I don’t want to just sit around and whine about why I don’t have enough money, about why I can’t do the job. Just let me roll up my sleeves. We said that we would transfer more African-American students to UC than any other college. And we do. It’s up to the college president to get the job done. But most college presidents just mousy around. If the president doesn’t get the job done, then get rid of the president. [Wild applause.]

Edelstein: There are two important issues here that I’d like to come back to. One is the issue of community college commitment to transfer, the role of leadership in that, and the other is the issue of the community college baccalaureate degree. But there was another point you made, Dick—what’s happening this fall. Community college enrollments will be smaller. Predictions of a 50 percent increase in demand notwithstanding, what we’re actually seeing are declines in most community colleges around the state.

What’s your perception about what’s happening? Is this entirely an issue of students getting discouraged by this constant drumbeat about higher fees and less access, or are there other factors in play?

McCallum: The impact on some 130,000 students is not all that complex. The \$50-per-unit BA differential fee eliminated about 60,000 students, strictly due to cost. We know that when we went to \$13 per unit for all other students, that was

another 25,000 or 30,000 students, based on cost. And we’ve eliminated 12,000 course sections statewide. You don’t eliminate 12,000 sections and avoid losing students! We’ve cut back access in this system, much like what CSU has done.

Recently, we’ve artificially reduced the cap, which has given the districts the ability to cut back on courses still further.

Meanwhile, we’re seeing that community college students are getting younger. We’re picking up some CSU students, though not many UC students, and our retention rates are increasing. We’re seeing much more interest, again, in increasing transfer as a function of the community colleges.

The issue that comes around is, we have to be open to change but it’s always a zero-sum game. Yeah, great idea—let’s offer baccalaureate degrees, as Richard proposed. Very good idea, because we know that people with BA or BS degrees will do better in life. National fact: People with high school degrees or less are unemployed now at the rate of

If we increase the number of slots for baccalaureate degrees, what do we *not* offer?

about 11 percent, while that’s 3.4 percent for people with baccalaureate degrees. There’s a direct correlation with level of education. Whatever the jobs are, they go to people with degrees.

But if we increase the number of slots at Santa Monica College for baccalaureate nursing degrees, what do we *not* offer?

What’s the implication when 75 percent of community college students need basic skills or remedial education? Gerry Hayward is absolutely right, the high schools *should* do a better job. But that’s not going to happen next year.

The fact is, these students are coming in. They need to upgrade their skills and training. The fact is,

they need two-year degrees. The fact is, the vocational education students are the neglected majority. Most people will not transfer. Somehow we have to look at all this in totality, in a zero-sum way.

Richard's idea, and other innovative ideas—I think we ought to try them, to model them, and see what happens.

At the same time we have to look at our total mission and how these things interrelate in numbers. Right now, out of 1.34 million community college students, 50,000 students each year transfer to UC or CSU or independent colleges. What are those

**We graduate more
community college students
from CSU than those who
started at CSU.
Six out of ten CSU graduates
started at the
community colleges.**

other students doing? Our mission is also to educate the future work force of California.

Moore: I think we could double the number of students transferring to UC if we wanted to. I don't know where the laws are that would force UC to accept them, but any college out here could double their number of UC transfer students. They won't accept them. They keep increasing the acceptable GPA. According to the Master Plan, the necessary GPA is 2.4. But nobody ever reads the Master Plan. It's not 2.4. It's 3.2, or 3.9. We're the second-highest transfer school to UC Berkeley—and 4.0s don't make it into Berkeley. So, to serve our students, we make joint—double—or triple or quadruple applications for our students. Because if UC Berkeley won't take you, Riverside will. I back up my students.

How many of you do denial counseling? It

needs to be done. Because most of us learned a bad rule. The rule we learned was, if you get turned down by UC you can't go. That's dumb. The rule that works is, call UC and ask them why you didn't get in. And they will tell you, precisely: "You didn't take Math 20." Or, "You'd be accepted if you changed your major." Or, "Why don't you agree to accept a one-semester delay?" Most people don't know that you can negotiate with the University of California—student by student. But that calls for some personal contact between you and the UC transfer transcript analyst, who you've got to take out to lunch. [Laughter.] So later you can call that person and ask why your student didn't get in. And they'll tell you, and maybe make some suggestions.

I love you, Patrick, but this is not about job training or the state of the state's economy.

This is about getting students into the University of California. We already own the CSU system. We graduate more community college students from CSU than those who started at CSU. Six of ten CSU graduates started at the community colleges. But the UC system is the elite system, and if we're sending 15,000 now, we could send 30,000.

Yet UC is not a wonderful place for all people. We have learned that some of our African-American students do not feel comfortable at UC. They don't want to be the token students at that school. So we said, "OK, then, what's your game plan?" They said: Historically black colleges are great alternatives—private schools, because their tuition rate is one-third less than all the other private colleges and universities.

So now Santa Monica College is the largest feeder school to historically black colleges. For African-Americans, we bifurcate the market—half to UC, half to historically black schools. But that calls for a specific plan. You transfer more students by creating more slots.

Viar: But in addition to creating more slots, you also have to think a bit differently about the issue of course-to-course articulation. You described all

of the different one-on-one activities that needed to take place in order for your people to get students into those increased slots. How absurd that is, that university professors—and not just UC, but CSU as well—are cutting. Even CSU is cutting, they're no longer accepting large numbers of transfer students. [CSU Chancellor] Barry Munitz has decided that they'll find places to cut back. So I'm not sure we really have this one covered.

I think we have to start putting on some real pressure statewide, talking about a new approach—an assessment-based transfer or competency-based transfer model, one not based on a course and what it looks like and how it's taught as determined by a UC or CSU professor. Instead, we need to get our respective faculty together—probably forced by legislative action, because that seems to be the only way to get things going—and sit down and develop those competencies that are expected when students enter their junior- and senior-level courses. What kinds of skills do they need in order to succeed in those classes? Not what book they learned from, not what syllabus was available for that class, not what method they were taught by—but what is needed to succeed.

If we get away from the course-to-course, one-on-one activity, we don't have to devote so much attention to calling UC administrators and asking why that student wasn't accepted and what we need to change. Each time a division or department meets at UC, they change the requirements.

We need to get down to talking about what it is that we are delivering. That means we in the community colleges need to be prepared to start doing some assessments, to show what skill levels students demonstrate when they have an associate degree. How nice it would be to be in the position with the Legislature to say that if a student has an associate degree from a California community college, we *know* that's quality, we *know* that what the student learns is appropriate. And our students would be automatically guaranteed junior status at UC or CSU.

I suggest we need a double effort—the state effort to increase the numbers, but also our efforts, to change the way in which we look at articulation.

Edelstein: That's exactly what people who have not been through the community college system assume happens—that when somebody gets an AA degree, that's automatic access to a four-year institution. The kind of system you describe, David, is a little bit like the Florida system, in which both community college students and the university's native students have to show specific competencies to rise to the junior level. Regina, what would be the faculty response be to a system like that?

Stanback-Stroud: I think you need to look at the issue of competencies within whatever context you are presenting. If you're talking about competencies as a tool for advice and placement, that's different than talking about competencies to serve as a gate [to determine access]. We just had the discussion at the [Academic Senate] session.

For example, the suggestion showed up in the Commission on Innovation report on exit testing. Basically that would allow students to attend community college with the test determining whether or

What is it that historically black colleges and universities are doing that we can learn from?

not he or she would receive an associate degree. Should we as faculty support that? It was our assertion that if a student goes to the community colleges, meets the class objectives, takes those final exams, and is successful, then that should certify that that student is qualified to receive an associate degree. If, however, you're looking at exit exams or

competency exams as a way to measure what we want students to achieve, then we would look at that and make decisions about how we would deliver that instruction what methodology we would use, what approach we would use. That would be a different aspect of competencies.

While we might have to look at the state's needs and at the institution and its commitment, we also have to look at the faculty and the teaching of different material. And when I say faculty, I mean all faculty, because all faculty—instructional faculty, counseling faculty, learning resources faculty, every one of those faculty—teach, whether they teach a class of 30 or they teach a class of one.

I came from Howard University, and I have long been asking, "What is it that historically black colleges and universities are doing that we can learn from to increase our students' success?"

I will tell you that walking on Howard's campus—coming from being raised in the south, coming from segregation—was *the* experience for me. This may seem foreign and very "historical" to many people, but I'm young enough to remember drinking from colored-only fountains, to remember that we couldn't go inside the bus station, that we couldn't sit at the counter in restaurants. It's phenomenal that my mother, who didn't have a formal education, ended up getting *me* to this stage today. Howard University had a lot to do with that. I don't believe that the University of California or CSU could have taken Regina Stanback at that point and helped to make Regina Stanback what she is today. At Howard, I *was* going to succeed. It was just a matter of when and how. My faculty at Howard knew that, and they made me know that.

We can learn things from schools like Howard. The average teaching style doesn't take into account our differences—whether students are relational learners or analytical learners. It so happens that common teaching practices value, reward, support, and advance the analytical or "linear" learner. That happens to be the learning style of people who classify themselves as white. People who classify themselves as other ethnic groups are predominantly

relational learners.

My son is a good example of what happens to relational learners. By the time he was in the third grade he was in trouble. "He's not doing his work. He's a behavior problem. He's a discipline problem." By the time we got down to dealing with the issue, I heard: "They've got to learn responsibility. We're not going to lower our standards." When I took him out of that situation and had him tested, it turned out he was intellectually gifted. In one year, in another situation, he was performing three grade levels higher—three grade levels according to their evaluation. Had I not made that move, or had the resources to make that move, there would have been one more child lost. And you all would have been sitting here saying, "How can we get him off the streets and into our colleges?" Teaching styles have a direct effect on transfer.

If you look at who's doing the teaching, there's an enrichment that can take place just by having diverse perspectives. I know that the content of melanin in your skin does not necessarily give you a richer perspective than anybody else. But your experiences may, your thinking patterns, the way you receive information. We are all very different individuals.

Edelstein: It's getting a little difficult to corral the 700 or 800 great ideas that are floating around out there. But I'd like to get back to the issue of competency-based education. There are a lot of strong opinions on both sides, about the value and validity of competency-based education and about the possibility of developing a system that does not have a disproportionate effect on underrepresented groups. Patrick, you work closely with the Legislature. Is there discussion of this kind of system? After the failure of AB 1725 and SB 121 to make a significant difference in transfer effectiveness, is there a discussion of more radical solutions?

McCallum: If you go to competency-based articulation, there's one thing that will never

change—and that is that UC and CSU faculty will be involved in determining what that competency base is. So you're going to exchange one set of problems—course numbering, what courses are acceptable—for what is probably a more difficult set of problems, especially looking at the incredible problems facing community colleges across the state.

The second thing that's not going to change comes from constitutional protections. You're not going to take away departmental authority and faculty authority to determine courses from the University of California. It's just not going to happen. And as long as a two-thirds vote is required, you're not going to get major tax increases [to support education] in this state.

So I can tell you, as I did, that we ought to talk about our vision—including transferring more community college students to UC. But we're stuck with some existing situations.

The Legislature is moving toward more accountability in education. They're spending billions, and they're asking, "What's happening with the students? Are they learning?" The direction is toward requiring more accountability. Measure them at the freshman level then measure them at the exit level, and see how they've succeeded.

Many in the community colleges say, "Come up with a test that's valid, that we believe in, and that's not discriminatory." If we thought coming up with a common course numbering system was a difficult job . . . [Laughter]. So again, we have good ideas about where we want to go, but how do we do it?

Richard is right. We transfer based on the number of slots UC determines, the year before, that they'll accept. The fact is, if they took more students, we've got students who are eligible to go in.

So, the first issue is slots. We're not going to get the University of California to dramatically increase slots. We can get them, over time, to create more slots. That makes sense for the students and makes sense for the state, given the cost issue. But

the big numbers are at CSU. We still transfer 35,000 to 40,000 students to CSU, and in two years CSU has dropped by 4,000 slots while UC has stayed the same. There have to be incentives for growth.

Another issue is articulation. The same issues are here that have been here forever. We need to apply some common logic to benefit students. They ought to be able to come in, know what courses are acceptable, and whether they can get in or not.

The third issue is what Regina is talking about, the value of collaborative learning.

We can't get so focused on everything else that's going on at the community colleges that we lose our emphasis on teaching. That has to be our primary focus.

**There are about three
people in the Legislature
who probably care
about transfer or
who really understand
that it's an issue.**

Viar: There are about three people in the Legislature who probably care about transfer or who really understand that it's an issue.

McCallum: That many?

Viar: Well, I wanted to be nice, just in case I missed a couple. The one I know of is Senator Gary Hart, who has consistently brought forward suggestions for improving transfer. But Senator Hart is leaving. We, as community colleges, have not put forth the effort to lobby the Legislature on this subject with the same kind of vigor that we do when it comes to the budget. When it comes to the budget, we're well organized.

Every union, every faculty association, the Academic Senate, the League, the administrators, the CEOs all do a halfway decent job of coming together and presenting our needs for money.

But when was the last time we sat down as groups and asked, "What can we do to bring this problem to the attention of the Legislature?" How many anecdotes can we pull together that put a human face to the kinds of situations that Richard Moore was describing? We need to let the legislators know "Your voters are being faced with this, and it's a growing problem."

If we made a major commitment to put this on the forefront of our legislative agenda, legislators might start talking about some creative solutions. That means, one, we have to have the commitment; two, we have to have some idea of what we want to propose; and, three, we have to have the guts to go up against UC and its powerful lobby and CSU and its fairly strong lobby to push this—even if it means embarrassment.

We compromised on SB 121. We didn't need to compromise, I don't think, at that point. We certainly need to raise the level of discussion. The Legislature, right now, doesn't care and isn't aware.

Edelstein: *Well, clearly, if the problem is number of slots, as Patrick suggests is the major problem, what kind of proof do we have that there's a cohort of well-prepared students in the community colleges who have been denied access to UC and CSU?*

Moore: That's not the issue. There's lots of evidence of that. That's begging the question. The Master Plan says [the required GPA is] 2.4 and ex-number of units. Based on that, we can send twice as many students. They've raised the GPA in order to ration access. They have restricted how many slots there are for transfer. We need the battle to get more slots opened up.

I think we need to do some other things. The state's not going to change. They're going to talk and chitchat. It's going to be the same in ten years.

In my opinion, don't waste your time. But you can change your institutions.

I think we should honor the ten best transfer center directors. Get them up here, and get them to trade secrets.

Number two—I'm a capitalist at heart, I teach economics—there is no reward for doing a better job. Nobody says, "The ten best transfer colleges are [fill in the blanks] and here's an extra \$50,000."

Stanback-Stroud: Define "best."

Moore: You make the definition. You define it, OK? And then I'd reward them. But we treat it just like a government bureaucracy.

Stanback-Stroud: But you're talking about numbers.

Moore: You define it. Nobody rewards excellence. Nobody says, "The school that transfers the most African-Americans to UC gets an extra \$50,000." That might get them to hire extra counselors. Nobody says, "Let's take the transfer center budget of the Chancellor's Office and use it to reward outstanding performance."

McCallum: Ten campuses transfer 60 percent [of all transfer students]?

Edelstein: *Twenty campuses transfer 50 percent. Another 20 campuses at the bottom transfer a total of 2 percent.*

Stanback-Stroud: But the issue is not the numbers, not necessarily just the numbers. Let's take two hypothetical colleges. Say I have a large number of students who don't speak English as a first language, and I take that diverse population of students and they succeed—whether it's through transfer or through completion of the program—and I transfer ten. And another college starts with students comfortable with English and they did have

all those skills and came in with the reading levels that they needed, etcetera. And they transfer twenty. That doesn't mean they did a better job. Both of us were successful, and my guess is that I had a harder job. The number doesn't define the success or the criteria.

**I think results count.
I think you can challenge
your faculty to make a
difference. I'd like to see the
Chancellor's Office
reward schools
that do a good job.**

Moore: I think that's a nice speech. But I think numbers *do* count. I think the story you tell is an important story and that accomplishment ought to be rewarded. But I also think the people who transfer students ought to be rewarded. We at Santa Monica have a reputation, and we draw students from all over Los Angeles. The message is, "If you want a hope of changing your life, get to Santa Monica. Because Santa Monica will get you to the University of California." If you don't care to get to UC, go to some other college. There are a lot of them in the LA basin, maybe 20.

You should stand there on Pico Boulevard and watch people get off the buses. Those are all people of color getting off those buses and coming to this college, because they know we are the one chance they have of getting into the University of California. And they come with whatever skill levels they have. And we send more African-Americans to UC than any other college in this state. We send more Latinos to the University of California than any other college in this state.

I think results count. I think you can challenge

your faculty to make a difference. I'd like to see the Chancellor's Office reward schools that do a good job. And I'd like to see us try some pilot programs. Try a baccalaureate degree program. We're going to have to do some things differently. If you want to change the state of California, good luck. But we can do some things locally.

Edelstein: *Colleges respond to incentives. But students also respond to incentives. The bill the Chancellor talked about earlier, SB 1672, is that a Hart bill? That bill establishes the CCIP, the Community College Incentive Program, which would—for students who were originally eligible for UC—guarantee admission to UC if they did their first two years at a community college, and would waive their fees for their junior and senior years. That's a very powerful incentive, and it sounds like a very, very positive program. But there are some negatives as well. Some concerns have been expressed that this program would work to the disadvantage of so-called "native" community college students, those who are not originally eligible for UC or CSU. What's the discussion around the state on this piece of legislation?*

McCallum: Based on general discussion in the Legislature, it's popular, given the issue of increased fees at UC. It's a way for many parents to deal with the cost of getting their kids through UC. There's general bipartisan support. The issues for the community colleges are great, though, and I think they will come out.

First of all, 85 percent of all community college students who transfer to UC were not UC-eligible at the time they started community college. So the fact is, if you don't increase the number of slots at the University of California, you are creating a displacement for those students. That's the first issue that has to be dealt with.

The second issue is, you're driving more students into the community colleges, which does present the possibility of driving up our costs unless

we're funded for the added growth. Hart's bill establishes a pilot program, so the immediate impact is not great, but at some point we would have to look at that.

The third issue is, if UC is not receiving fees for those students, then they're going to say, "Well, backfill those fees." The minute you do that, you've created a new cost. The Legislature will not fund it.

So, what we'll end up with is a system that goes back to what our SB 121 was: You're UC-eligible, you elect to start at the community colleges, and you'll be guaranteed admission if you complete these courses. Because of cost and access, the direction is to drive more students into the community college system over time.

But unless we make a major effort, UC will not increase, proportionately, the number of transfer slots to match the demand. It'll probably go through, but it'll get back to what we were originally talking about with SB 121. The University of California will have to find slots for those students. "If you have to go to 30/70, if you have to rearrange your graduate programs, that's fine. Just find a slot for these students."

Viar: I've heard basically the same thing, from faculty leaders and others. I've heard a concern about the effect on students who come to the community colleges *not* eligible for UC or CSU. Will we end up with an elite little group on our campuses who are "the UC eligible," treated very well, and then sent off to UC and CSU?

But on the other hand, I think we need to go back to this concept of being creative, launching pilot projects, trying new things. We're very good, at the community colleges, at tearing down other people's new ideas and coming up with all the reasons it won't work. With 106 colleges, it's very easy to find five people to come up with arguments against your idea. I think we ought to be courageous enough to step forward and say: "It's a new idea, it has some merit, let's work on how we can deal with some of the problems. But let's move forward with it." And that's what I'm encouraging

people to do. It's one of those that can be a good pilot project. We can find out what the flaws are. It lets the issue I raised earlier come forward, talking with legislators about the transfer problem and the cost and all the others. I think it's something we need to pursue—vigorously.

Stanback-Stroud: It still gives us the opportunity, though, to make sure we continue to serve the students we were intended to serve. If you have this group of students come in—and because of budget cuts it's already so competitive just to get a math class or English class—they may compete with our students. Our students may not know the strategy necessary—waiting in line all night before registration—to win a seat in that class. So we need to make sure we continue to pay attention, and not end up displacing *those* students with UC-ready students.

Viar: There was a study done at San Diego State University that hasn't been released yet, and I think it fits in here with some of what we've been talking about. It was a study of the 1992 graduates at San Diego State who had started in the community college, who had transferred.

The average student was 20 years old when he or she started at the community college, and took five years before entering the university. That group—59 percent—had interrupted their studies at the community college during that five years at least two times, some for as long as four semesters. Twenty-five percent had failed at least one community college course, 75 percent had dropped at least one course, and 70 percent had taken remedial courses. That was the group that had gotten to San Diego State, had transferred, and then successfully gotten their degrees.

Once they got to San Diego State University, five years after starting at community college, only seven percent interrupted their studies, only one-fourth dropped a course. And they graduated in three years.

So what we're seeing is, a large number of

these students who we could very easily just write off—"We can get our numbers, we can get our UC students, we've done our transfer mission"—can't be written off. We can't forget the students you all are working with all the time, day to day. The faculty need to be paying attention, too, because we see that once they got through community college, they understood the value of that baccalaureate degree—and were ready to persist once they hit the university. And they graduated with a .1 percent *higher* GPA than the university's native students.

McCallum: That's where the policy debate is. Our policy makers still assume the traditional college student. Despite all of our efforts to educate legislators, they don't realize that *that* is our student. David's right. We need to tell legislators. That hasn't happened.

The original idea of the Master Plan, in 1960, was to go to 40/60 to create slots for community college students—and to assure a transfer program in the community colleges. In the beginning UC-eligible students often started at community college. Then UC and CSU made a concerted effort to take more freshman students, and the number of community college transfers dropped correspondingly. There was a direct correlation.

So we maintain our core academic curriculum, and attract those UC and CSU students so we can offer those advanced courses. Yet at the same time we must recognize that our students are different now than they were 20 or 25 years ago and need a different kind of educational climate. It's a tricky balance.

Comments from the Audience

Dr. Edelstein noted that now there are fewer resources to support the transfer function at the community colleges, along with minimal feedback from CSU and UC about "what the slots are, where the transfer slots are, and when they're going to be open." The entire articulation process,

he said, at least at the local level, seems much less satisfactory than even a few years ago.

"Strong leadership" from the community colleges is what's needed to move transfer students—particularly underrepresented students—through the system, one participant stated. Decategorization of transfer and other special-purpose funds, he said, represents the "death count—we won't see these kinds of funds by the end of the decade."

Another member of the audience reiterated the importance of community colleges emulating practices of historically black colleges for the benefit of the community colleges' native students—and about transferring students *to* those colleges. Dr. Edelstein observed that what those colleges do, like most small liberal arts colleges, "is not mysterious"—giving enormous amounts of support and encouragement to their students. "When we give *five percent* of that kind of support to our students, people say we're coddling our students. It takes a different attitude about success and failure."

Patrick McCallum discussed FACCC's exploration, with Dr. John Matsui of UC Berkeley, of offering a statewide workshop on diversity issues inside and outside the classroom—and

***You are expected to do well,
you are expected to graduate,
there's no question about it.***

distributing that information and experience throughout the college system.

Richard Moore followed up with the observation that "formal mentoring" for many nontraditional students is critical. "That's what you do on campus when you run out of money." It's the college's responsibility, not the counselor's. "If you can't mentor a student, you don't belong in education."

Regina Stanback-Stroud talked about her

experiences as a mentor in the Higher Ground Program—and also suggested that faculty colleagues find out just what students experience when they arrive on campus, from trying to obtain basic information to actually making it through registration. How all campus personnel respond is critical. “Sometimes what seems real simple to the person sitting behind that desk are extreme barriers and extreme obstacles to those trying to receive that service.”

Moore concurred. “You’ve got to train the entire campus. I want my parking security officer to say ‘Glad to see you back on campus, great outfit’ rather than throwing them up against the wall. And make your admissions people stand in line. Once they stand in line they’ll change that process. I do that to my deans, too.” [Laughter]

One participant observed that at historically black colleges and universities, “you are *expected* to do well, you are *expected* to graduate, there’s no question about it.”

Discussion Session I

Student Equity and Diversity in the Transfer Process

Despite good intentions and genuine commitment at various levels of California higher education, students of color continue to be underrepresented, proportionately, in the ranks of transfer students. It is also true that a lower percentage of these students go on to receive baccalaureate and graduate degrees. What roles can the community colleges play in improving the academic success of all students?

Two individuals were invited to discuss this particular issue.

Dr. Penny Edgert, Assistant Director for Academic Programs and Policy for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), received her B.A. in psychology and her master's degree in sociology from the University of California at Santa Barbara. She received a Ph.D. in Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistical Analysis from the University of Chicago. Dr. Edgert has held a variety of policy analysis and research positions at prestigious institutions around the country. Starting in 1971, her career became increasingly focused on assisting people who do not usually benefit from the higher education system.

Dr. John Matsui is an alumnus of UC Berkeley, where he earned a B.A. in ecology and a master's degree in behavioral ecology. He earned his doctorate, in science education, from UC Santa Barbara. Dr. Matsui has been very active on the Berkeley campus in attempting to change attitudes on race and diversity. He is currently working to increase the numbers of ethnic minority students within the molecular biology department, with the help of a grant from the Howard Hughes Medical

Institute.

The panel presentation and the audience discussion that followed were facilitated by Trustee **Lynn Baranco** of the Peralta Community College District.

The Discussion

In 1988 the California Legislature "became very concerned about the uneven success of the educational system in educating students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds," Edgert said. "Specifically I would argue that the educational systems in this country and in this state have been more successful in educating white and Asian students than they have been in educating black and Latino students."

Edgert asked the audience to "reflect on the way I said that—because the way in which it is normally said is that black and Latino students are less successful in education than are white and Asian students." The onus, she said, is actually on the education system.

Also in 1988, the California Postsecondary Education Commission issued a declaration of policy on educational equity that had a quantitative goal: "The goal of educational equity is achieved when the composition of [groups of] individuals at all educational levels, from elementary schools to college faculty and administrative ranks, mirrors the demography of the state. Realizing this goal requires enhanced success at all education levels, so that there is similar achievement among all groups."

That statement—like most statements about the aims of student equity efforts, Edgert observed—is quantitative, when the real goal is *qualitative*. “The goal of education is achieved,” she said, “when pluralism and excellence are equal partners in a quality educational environment, especially with regard to curriculum, teaching, research, and public service.”

Both quality and quantity, as they relate to educational equity, are important, Edgert said.

CPEC’s study of student equity began with the question the Legislature asked: Is it feasible to develop an educational equity assessment system? But, she said, CPEC ended up answering another question: Is it possible to develop an assessment system that evaluates “campus climate”?

Campus climate can be defined as “the formal and informal environment—both institutional and community-based—in which individuals learn, teach, work, and live in a postsecondary setting.”

The perceptions of students, faculty, and staff are crucial in examining campus climate, according to Edgert, because people’s *perceptions* determine what people do, not any “objective” view of reality. Perceptions are the proper lens through which to view campus climate, she argued, though that concept still lacks acceptance in many quarters.

After lengthy interviews and focus group research, CPEC researchers identified seven key areas for assessing campus climate: faculty and student interaction, curriculum, academic support, student life, campus leadership, community involvement, and campus image. Studying those factors, Edgert pointed out, should make it possible to determine how supportive the campus climate is for all students and all staff, especially for those from historically underrepresented groups.

The second phase involved creating survey instruments to field test the assessments.

“The bottom line was our first recommendation—that every California college and university should plan, develop, and implement an assessment of its campus climate that is appropriate to its own

institutional mission and values.” Every campus should “just do it, to quote the Nike commercial,” Edgert said, but how each campus does it should be highly individual.

The resultant CPEC Resource Guide, released during a time of budget cuts and resource limitations, was designed to serve as a resource for those colleges and universities that chose to assess their campus climates, she added.

“From the perspectives of community colleges, state universities, and independent colleges and universities, I’m quite pleased to report, after two years, the extent to which the campuses have taken our recommendations seriously. You might notice that I left out one sector of California higher education—and we’ll just leave that one ‘left out.’”

What the project actually accomplished, Edgert concluded, was to ask colleges and universities to do something that is very difficult to do—“to be very introspective, and deliberately so, about whether or not their campuses are inclusive and receptive to all students.”

The process of examining campus climate is uncomfortable, she said, because people often

**Examining campus climate
is uncomfortable
because people
often discover things
they would rather not know.**

discover “things they would rather not know” about what students, staff, and faculty think. And none of California’s college and university campuses are as welcoming as they could be, according to Edgert.

“But if you don’t have the information, you cannot change your campus.”

A “sense of belonging,” according to John Matsui, is very important to supporting the retention and success of underrepresented students in a

college or university environment. Students' sense of belonging is increased when they can identify themselves as members of a group or discipline. This is significant, he said, "because you need to put your paths where people walk."

"Front-loading of resources" is also a key element of programs that best support nontraditional students, since "nothing supports success like early success." Encouraging students to assist or mentor other students in appropriate situations—"passing on information that isn't written"—also supports success, "because there's no better way to learn than to teach."

Encouraging the mentoring of students by supportive, sensitive faculty and staff is also important, Matsui pointed out. Too often, students simply assume that others have never struggled against the same fears and obstacles to achieve their goals. Understanding that others have faced the same problems, and have overcome them, can be invaluable.

Another characteristic of successful student support programs, according to Matsui, is "setting high expectations." Challenging students to succeed and expecting no less than a student's best work support success. Providing reality checks—or, sharing basic information about what the college experience or a given course of study will actually be like—is equally important.

Also, whenever possible, students should have the opportunity to work directly in the discipline, to directly research what they are studying in class. That way, "they develop a sense that that discipline signifies more than just a distant goal, and they develop a sense of excitement." One's work in life is more than just a "litany of facts," Matsui said. In reality, "it's an open-ended enterprise, one in which questions are asked and argued over, where mistakes are made, and where one's mistakes may lead to major discoveries."

The connection between course work and career goals must be made explicit, Matsui pointed out, so students also understand why they need to master math, organic chemistry, and the like. "If

those explicit connections can be made—between career goals and what students are doing now—there's a greater likelihood that students will hang in there. In essence, we need to create a map for students, to put up signposts."

Many of these types of student services cost very little money, he said, especially when colleges make better use of existing resources.

To better support underrepresented students, Matsui also suggested that campuses make a conscious effort to answer students' "next step" questions at critical transition points—questions asked when coming out of high school, for example, when planning community college courses, and when planning a transfer program.

Colleges should also reconceptualize what it means for students to be "prepared." Beyond academic skills and knowledge, "students really need to become 'systems smart,' or learn how to negotiate the system—the kind of information that's not in print anywhere."

Students need to be prepared for the fact that, while they may have been "stars" at their community colleges, that may change once they transfer. "'Help' is not a four-letter word," Matsui said. "Asking for help doesn't mean remediation. Being willing to ask for help when you need it gives a student a competitive edge when they made need it most, a mind shift that students need to be prepared to accept."

Beyond making better use of existing resources to support the success—including transfer success—of underrepresented students, institutions also need to make changes, Matsui said.

"Research is needed. But so often research focuses on failures. It's also important to take a look at successes. Why, for example, do historically black colleges and universities do so well?"

Researching student success profiles, he said, can dispel faculty and staff mythology about student success—and can help colleges and universities provide the services and support systems that actually encourage students.

Faculty and staff also need to be educated about the importance of understanding cultural diversity.

The Recommendations

1 Encourage efforts, at community colleges and transfer institutions, to assess and improve "campus climate"—particularly for underrepresented groups.

2 Encourage faculty and staff involvement in advising and mentoring students—and help faculty and staff understand that it's everyone's job to support individual student success.

3 Educate faculty and staff about cultural diversity and differences, about how to communicate with

and understand others. Encourage experimentation with, and acceptance of, a variety of teaching and learning styles.

4 Encourage institutions to adapt to students, instead of continuing to force the adjustment of students to institutional traditions, practices, and assumptions.

5 Develop curricula and student programs and services that include the known elements of successful student support systems.

6 Support deeper research into both student success and failure, to find out what truly encourages student success and retention. Such research may also serve to debunk long-standing myths about underrepresented students.

Discussion Session II

Community Colleges and Higher Education in California: What is the Evolving Role of the System in Ensuring Student Academic Success?

California higher education institutions are changing rapidly, along with most of the traditional assumptions that shaped the state's systems of higher education. Short-range and piecemeal solutions to what are now understood to be long-term challenges are no longer viable. What changes and solutions should the California Community Colleges pursue? What is the colleges' role, now and in the future, in relation to the transfer process—and to the universities?

This discussion session featured panelists **Leo Chavez**, President of West Valley College, and **Tom Nussbaum**, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for the Legal Affairs and Contracts Division of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. **Erlinda Martinez**, Administrative Dean for Student and Community Affairs at Mission College, served as moderator for the panelists' presentation and as facilitator for the group discussion that followed.

The Discussion

Leo Chavez began the discussion by reviewing the issues with which colleges must deal effectively in order to improve the transfer function. These issues, presented "in no particular order of importance," fall into four major areas:

Technology, "both in terms of what it will force us to do and in terms of what it will allow

us to do." The technology discussion, Chavez said, includes not just "the ubiquitous information superhighway or the nefarious distance learning concept," but the "*culture* that that technology will impose on us—particularly the very young people who will grow up with it." Broad cultural applications of technology will bring with them "a whole different set of expectations." Technology, he said, will "infuse our young people with the demand for convenience," much like new cable TV trends, allowing viewers to order programs and services whenever they want them, whenever it's most convenient.

Demographics, including the much-discussed change in cultural demographics as "so-called minority students become the so-called majority." We're still looking for a new terminology, Chavez noted, to "describe the changing face of California."

Complexity of the Community College Mission and of the Transfer Process, "the job we're asked to do, something we don't spend much time discussing." In a typical community college classroom, Chavez said, a 19-year-old UC-eligible students will sit next to a 55-year-old grandparent along with a 30-year-old single parent—and everyone in between.

Funding in an Era of Declining Resources, with nothing on the horizon to suggest that we can increase funding at a rate sufficient to

(1) accommodate the growth in population, (2) keep pace with the cost of living, and (3) do new things with additional resources.

All four issues are intertwined, according to Chavez, and will drive community college strategies for change: "Piecemeal adjustments and reforms" are inadequate. As Charles Handy has written in his book *The Age of Unreason*, Chavez suggested that we're going to need "upside-down thinking"—ways to reexamine our assumptions and arrive at appropriate strategies.

According to Tom Nussbaum, "the Master Plan doesn't work today. It has served us well and accomplished a lot, but now we have to have the courage to do what's right for our state and for its people."

The Master Plan for Higher Education was developed after World War II, when two million people came to California. Some 700,000 servicemen were "released" in California after that war, Nussbaum said. In 1960, when the Master Plan was created, the state's population was 80 percent white, 10 percent Latino, and 7 percent African-American.

"We put together that Master Plan to serve a population that was largely a traditional education clientele: white, full-time students." But that clientele has changed during the intervening years. The poor, the disadvantaged, and the unemployed are not well served. "Clearly, what we're accomplishing through the Master Plan is not working."

Among the new approaches Nussbaum suggested to better serve today's California: a three-year baccalaureate degree that community colleges could offer as well as four-year institutions. "We need to get away from that tradition of higher education that says, 'Let the student go to the instruction. Let the student go to the institution.' We need to bring the education to the students." And, these days, no university system designed for full-time students is "ever going to get us where we want to go."

Fundamental reforms addressed by Chavez included the question of whether or not the commu-

nity colleges should include the University of California in transfer planning at all, since UC was designed to serve single 18- or 19-year-olds. The typical day student at West Valley College is between 28 and 35, a single parent with two children who provides their sole support.

"I just don't see any place at UC for that student at the University of California—and I don't see the University of California display any desire whatsoever to accommodate the student."

In effect, Chavez said, the Master Plan says *not* that it will take the state's top twelve-and-a-half percent of students, but "will take a 19-year-old with a median family income of \$70,000 and whose parents both went to college." By contrast, the community colleges were designed to attract first-generation college students, with the CSU system covering the middle ground.

"The UC system was simply not designed to accommodate the typical community college student," he said. "Why we spend so much time beating our heads over UC transfers is something of a mystery to me. I would argue that all of our UC transfers from the community colleges are individuals who were going to attend the University of California anyway—and are probably not affected, in any significant way, by anything that we do."

The typical community college student, by contrast—the student who could not go to the University of California, or perhaps to any college, right out of high school—"is restricted by an enormous number of financial and family issues that basically eliminates the University of California as a possibility."

"Most community college campuses [that transfer significant numbers of students to UC] are within a thirty-minute drive of a UC campus. So one of the first things we should do is pick up all of our campuses and move them close to a UC campus."

"Value-added education" is another factor the community colleges should examine, Chavez said, meaning that the colleges should measure students'

abilities and skills when they enter the system and when they leave—and that the system should be funded “at least in part” for whatever it accomplishes with each student, whenever they leave.

“It’s arrogant of us to assume that everyone comes to us with the same level of ability and a narrow range of desires and goals—and we do,” Chavez also observed. “Then we stuff them all into the same classrooms and teach to them, in the same way and at the same rate, for 18 weeks.”

To better serve students’ actual needs, he said, new technologies and new approaches should be introduced to “customize” education for every individual student.

“It’s ironic that the advances offered by technology will allow us to revert to a medieval style of education,” Chavez said. “In the Middle Ages, to get a degree you went to a professor. And that person gave you a list of books to read and a list of topics to understand and said, ‘Come back in a few years and I’ll give you an exam.’ There were discussions with that professor and with fellow students during that time, too, but when you were ready you returned, took the exam, and got your degree. I think we need to go back to that system, at least in part.”

According to Nussbaum, 38 percent of community college students statewide are ethnic minorities, 26 percent attend college full-time, and 74 percent attend part-time. *Eighty percent of community college students work either full-time or part-time.* And 28 percent, almost one-third, are low-income.

The University of California also has a large ethnic minority population, roughly 40 percent, most of those students of Asian heritage. But 91 percent of UC students attend full-time. At CSU, with a 39 percent minority population, 71 percent attend full-time.

“If you look at it from that perspective, in California we have 29 locations where students can pursue education beyond the community college level. We have to funnel them [transfer

students] in” from all over the state, Nussbaum observed. “So we’re fighting over those 40,000 [total UC and CSU] transfer slots. It just seems absurd to me.”

“We have to figure out a way to bring those programs to where the student is, so they can achieve their educational objectives”—or we’ll fail to provide those students with a college education.

Looking again at demographics, Nussbaum pointed out that by the year 2000 California will be 50 percent white, 33 percent Latino, 10 percent Asian-American, and 7 percent African-American. By 2020: 40 percent white, 40 percent Latino, 12 percent Asian-American, and 7 percent African American.

“It’s our duty to find a way to make education accessible to students,” Nussbaum said.

Chavez discussed the two main reasons that we provide education.

The first is to develop a trained and educated work force.

“But the second is even more fundamental and speaks to our very existence as a society—and that’s the issue of equity and the role that education plays in any democracy.” Some argue that class status is more important than race and ethnicity in terms of achieving equity, he said.

**I think there’s a place for elitists,
and for elitism. But it should be
an elitism of talent and
desire and drive,
not of class.**

In the American tradition, Chavez pointed out, the primary principle has been that every generation be better prepared and better educated than those that came before. Education has been the means to escape poverty, and to transcend the limitations of class.

Though UC does not now serve the needs

of the traditional community college student, he said, the social necessity of providing access and equity require us to find ways to change that.

"I think there's a place for an elitist institution. I think there's a place for elitists, and for elitism. But it should be an elitism of talent and desire and drive, and not of class," Chavez said.

"If the UC system is going to be an elitist institution, let it be elitist based on academic performance and these other issues we've discussed."

The Recommendations

The following recommendations, which grew out of the presentations summarized above and out of the audience discussions that followed, are organized logically but otherwise listed in no particular order of importance:

1 Shape and share with the public a new vision of what higher education can be in California, and incorporate that vision into a new Master Plan. Redefine transfer as many possible functions—including the functions of moving on to vocational education and to work.

2 Support the development of new leadership at all levels of California education, as private industry has successfully done. Develop education leadership which is comfortable with rapid and meaningful change.

3 Assess and discuss issues of educational access as determined by social class and economic status.

4 In reassessing the role of community colleges within California higher education, emphasize two fundamental principles—that the state needs a trained and educated work force, and that public education should be funded equitably.

5 In discussions of fundamental education reform, reassess the role of secondary schools.

6 Mobilize public opinion, at the grassroots level, to lobby the Legislature to support increased—not decreased—access to higher education in California. Emphasize that educational opportunity also includes "transfer" into quality vocational training programs.

7 Adjust the state's higher education institutions to meet student needs rather than attempt to adjust students to meet the needs of institutions. Switch the focus of education from teaching to learning.

8 Achieve cultural, ethnic, and gender balance among faculty and staff throughout all segments of California higher education.

9 Develop ways to customize the delivery of higher education in California, via new technologies and new teaching techniques, to meet the needs of the individual student—keeping in mind that 80 percent of community college students work either full-time or part-time.

10 Develop a three-year baccalaureate degree—a standard and a practice now fairly common in Europe—that can be offered at the community college level as well as at CSU and UC.

11 Avoid reliance on the University of California to meet the educational needs of traditional California Community Colleges students. Explore new ways to provide quality education to those students.

12 Continue to support the concept of "lifelong learning" as an appropriate function of the community college, CSU, and UC systems.

Discussion Session III

Ask the Universities: How Can We Work Together?

Recognizing that California's universities now face very real constraints on financial and other resources, as do the community colleges, how can we all work together to ensure educational opportunities? Are more restrictive admissions requirements and increasingly limited enrollments the only solutions? Are there realistic ways for the state's universities to accommodate greater numbers of transfer students? What cooperative approaches and strategies can these separate systems pursue—now, despite strained education budgets, and in the future—to more effectively support transfer students?

Panelists discussing these and related questions included **Joyce Justus**, Special Assistant of Educational Relations for the Office of the President, University of California; **Frieda Lee**, Director of Student Outreach Services at San Francisco State University; and **Ed Chambers**, Associate Vice President, Admissions and Records, San Jose State University. **John J. Sewart**, Director of Articulation and Research at the College of San Mateo, served as moderator for the panel and facilitated the group's discussion.

The Discussion

Given that all of California higher education now faces the dilemma of more students, less space available, and fewer resources, Joyce Justus of the University of California pointed out that the current question is "how to maintain access and diversity" despite these problems. Reviewing the university's mission, focusing on individual campus specialties

and priorities, and reorganization and "re-engineering" are among steps taken by UC to date. Changes within the university definitely affect transfer. There are departments at UC Berkeley, she pointed out, that have lost 85 percent of faculty due to early retirement.

Also being addressed are problems which impede UC's ability to coordinate efforts—removing "policy impediments to sharing resources across segments." The Berkeley campus, for example, operates on a semester system, the others on a quarter system. There are also serious articulation problems *between* the various UC campuses. "If we're going to downsize our academic programs," Justus said, "we have to create a system where UC students can take courses that count on any campus." The UC system is also experimenting with allowing students to take courses at CSU campuses for UC credit—starting with a successful longstanding arrangement between UC San Diego and San Diego State.

Among policy questions the UC system is *not* reconsidering, according to Justus, is modifying its mission—as defined by the Master Plan—in order to accommodate diversity. There is no reason to change UC's "highly elite" system, she said, when there are opportunities for students who don't initially meet UC eligibility criteria. Eighty-five percent of all community college transfer students to UC are "second chance" students, she said, not eligible for UC at the time they started college. In recent years the UC system has decided not to take community college transfer students who haven't completed their first two years of college. And,

according to Justus, there *are* students who just aren't ready for the university environment until later in their academic work.

For more effective transfer articulation, Justus said the conversation should shift from simply "how you get them in to how you get them out"—what the segments can do, together, to assure academic success. Discussion should focus on "what it is students need to know from lower division course work—at the University of California *and* at the community colleges—to be successful in upper division work."

Frieda Lee of San Francisco State stated that "it's myth that we are not accommodating students at CSU." According to Lee, CSU has always admitted—and still admits—"every qualified candidate who applies on time into a non-impacted program." The numbers have gone down recently, she added, and "analysis of those factors" is underway.

The CSU system assumes that California's economic decline along with increased student fees have played a major part in recent enrollment drops, she said. Other contributing factors, according to Lee, are new "enrollment management practices" designed to help the CSU system cope with leaner budgets.

Most of the CSU enrollment decline, Lee said, is due to a severe drop in the numbers of first-time freshmen. Lower-division transfer students make up the next largest category, followed by a very small number (2.9 percent of the total decline) of upper-division transfer students. She explained that the only substantial enrollment decrease among community college transfer students has been among lower-division students. The total number has dropped from 15,000 to 11,000, for a system-wide loss of 4,000 students.

And *that* drop, Lee explained, has been the result of the decision by larger CSU campuses to curtail the number of lower-division transfer students to accommodate more upper-division students, who are a "higher admission priority."

During the past five years, according to

Lee, the number of upper-division transfer students to CSU has dropped by only 425 students. That decline has been brought about by the decision at some campuses to require that upper-division students complete all of their general education requirements before admission.

So, compared to first-time freshmen and lower-division transfer students, "upper division transfer students have been spared a proportional reduction." And, as is now the case at UC, the average unit load at CSU has increased.

How many transfer students actually earn degrees from CSU?

In May of 1993, Lee said, CSU awarded the largest number of bachelors degrees "*ever*, in a single year, to former California Community Colleges students—approximately 29,000."

Among other things, she said, this result suggests that community college transfer students arrive prepared for university-level work. It also "tells us that students are finding the classes they need and they're getting out."

The overall CSU graduation rate is about 57 percent, close to the national average of 60 percent.

But, according to Lee, a very recent CSU report compares transfer students from Fall 1980 and 1985 and predicts even higher graduation rates in the future for transfer students—65 percent, or about 5 percent higher than the national norm. In the CSU view, these data suggest that "early continuous enrollment" has the greatest correlation with graduation success.

In other words, most transfer students who survive their first year at CSU will go on to graduate.

In 1993-94, Lee said, "more than 80 percent of all transfer students reenroll for their second year—and this is across all ethnic groups."

"This recent good news suggests that we can expect even greater gains in graduation rates [for transfer students] well into the 1990s," she added.

One cannot assess or predict student success without information on changing graduation rates, changing transfer rates, and changing student demo-

graphics, according to Lee. She strongly supported "participation in lengthy longitudinal data collection" on transfer students—"especially during the initial stages of transfer"—by all three segments of California higher education. Specifically, she said, this requires monitoring "new cohorts of California community colleges students" and tracking subsequent enrollments in four-year institutions as well as degrees earned.

For example: In the 1989 cohort of community college transfer students, 50 percent transferred 5.5 years after they graduated from high school and 50 percent took three years or longer, after transfer, to earn their baccalaureate degrees.

But in order to collect useful information, Lee said, segments must agree on how to collect data—and especially on how to define "transfer student." Students concurrently enrolled at CSU and at a community college, she observed, shouldn't be considered transfer students.

In Lee's view practical intersegmental cooperation also includes improving workshops, conferences, and institutes—at the local, regional, and state levels—for California Community Colleges counselors. Personal CSU outreach is more effective, she said, if counselors provide much of the basic information to students earlier in the process.

To improve services to students, Lee also strongly supported the idea of collaborating on outreach at high schools—and not just through representative involvement as panelists during education fairs. Traveling to high schools to meet with students who don't yet meet CSU admissions requirements is something CSU is already doing, she said. These and similar efforts can and should be achieved cooperatively—especially now, given budget constraints throughout higher education.

An area where "working together" will take on new meaning in the very near future, according to Ed Chambers of San Jose State, is technology.

"I believe technology is the wave of the future,"

Chambers said. By the year 2010, CSU will be expected to accommodate another 150,000 students, a task that "seems impossible." However, students coming into the system are brighter, computer literate, and "no-nonsense," he said. "They want to know what to take, when to take it, and how long it's going to take, so they can get on with their busy lives."

A greater reliance on technology throughout education, Chambers suggested, may well provide the tools that will make the "impossible" possible in the future.

Technology can help educational systems to work together more effectively, he said, primarily in the areas of (1) access and (2) instruction.

With the advent of voice technology in the late 1970s, "we saw a new era begin," he said. "People are waking up. We must do business with students and with faculty in different ways."

By 1995, he said, all CSU campuses will have

**A new era is beginning.
People are waking up.
We must do business
with students
and with faculty
in different ways.**

voice response technologies—meaning that the registration process as well as student access to admission status and financial aid information can be offered via computer.

In addition, he said, there will be new technologies, such as Electronic Data Interchange (EDI). "This allows us to make that transfer process almost seamless," according to Chambers—cutting the time involved and increasing efficiency.

San Jose State already receives electronic transcripts from several of its feeder schools via

EDI; six more institutions will be on-line within the next year. To implement the EDI system, he said, CSU has agreed to purchase EDI license agreements for all community colleges in California.

In addition, under the auspices of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council all three of California's public college systems as well as private institutions "are now working together—along with secondary education—to find the means of going to the Legislature for the funding to implement this technology," an achievement which will make transfer as efficient and accessible as possible.

The CSU system is also experimenting with electronic admissions applications, Chambers said. "By 1995-96, we believe your students—working from home—will be able to submit their applications directly to our mainframe computer," where they can be "uploaded" without data entry.

Another current technology experiment at CSU involves dispensing information to students via ATM-style kiosks on campus.

"Believe it or not," Chambers said while describing the setup now in place at San Jose State, "in a six-week period we had 28,000 transactions on campus alone—and that's just with continuing students."

In Chambers' view these types of technologies, interwoven throughout the state, can grant almost complete information and services to students who wish to transfer from one institution to another.

Efforts to share and coordinate information with secondary schools are also in the works.

"Not only should our students be able to register via telephone," he said. "They should be able to go to a kiosk on your campus and on my campus to register for the [transfer] campus of their choice, if they've been admitted."

Students will soon be able to obtain their admissions and financial aid status at on-campus kiosks, receive information on individual courses, even print out their own transcripts—

not to mention request campus maps and other types of local information.

And technology in instruction, Chambers said, will soon mean "that classes being taught in San Luis Obispo can be picked up in San Jose." Though the adjustment may be challenging for faculty, "we *can* do distance learning."

Technology, Chambers concluded, "is going to be our salvation." Getting the necessary funds—"and working together to put that money to good use"—will be critical for the future of California education, and for the futures of California's students, he said.

The Recommendations

Following lengthy discussion of these and other topics—particularly assessments of and experiences with the specific supports and barriers throughout the education system for transfer students—specific recommendations emerged. Suggestions for improving transfer effectiveness and success included the following, not listed in any particular order of importance:

- 1 Design and implement a mechanism to identify potential transfer students. Gather comprehensive and accurate information about both transfer student and potential transfer student populations.
- 2 Improve the dissemination of necessary information to potential transfer students regarding what they need to know in order to (1) transfer and (2) succeed in upper division course work.
- 3 Foster increased intersegmental faculty-to-faculty collaboration as a means to properly align lower-division curricula with upper-division.
- 4 Explore the potential uses of Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) and other technologies for providing students, counselors, admissions and records personnel, and articulation officers with

information vital to successful transfer.

5 Encourage greater collaborative and cooperative effort among the segments of California higher education, in light of barriers to achieving student education goals (such as increased fees, enrollment pressures, fewer financial resources).

6 Continue, and expand, the annual Counselor Institute (Ensuring Transfer Success workshops).

7 Expand the number of major preparation agreements.

8 Improve and “polish” the academic image of the California Community Colleges among high school counselors and advisors, students, and parents—and in the community at large. No one wants the community colleges viewed as the “place of last resort” or as centers designed for the educationally “less able.”
